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Introduction


Executive Order 13166 requires Federal agencies to assess and address the needs of otherwise eligible persons seeking access to federally conducted programs and activities who, due to limited English proficiency, cannot fully and equally participate in or benefit from those programs and activities. The DOJ LEP Guidance, in turn, advises each Federal department or agency to "take reasonable steps to ensure 'meaningful' access [to LEP individuals] to the information and services they provide." [DOJ LEP Guidance, 65 FR at 50124]. The DOJ LEP Guidance goes on to provide that:

[What constitutes reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access will be contingent on a number of factors. Among the factors to be considered are the number or proportion of LEP persons in the eligible service population, the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program, the importance of the service provided by the program, and the resources available to the [agency].]

Id. The DOJ LEP Guidance explains that the identification of "reasonable steps" to provide oral and written services in languages other than English is to be determined on a case-by-case basis through a balancing of all four factors.

The DOJ LEP and USDOT Guidance focuses principally on the obligation of Federal departments and agencies extending Federal financial assistance to clarify the long-standing legal obligation on the part of recipients of such assistance to address the language needs of their otherwise-eligible LEP beneficiaries. Executive Order 13166 applies this same obligation to programs and activities undertaken directly by a Federal department or agency. Section 2 of the Executive Order directs each Federal department or agency "to prepare a plan to improve access to . . . federally conducted programs and activities by eligible LEP persons . . . consistent with the standards set forth in the LEP Guidance . . . within 120 days (emphasis added)."
### State Transportation Agency (STA) Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. General</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the STA receive Federal financial assistance by means of grants, cooperative agreements, training, use of equipment, donations of surplus property, or other assistance? <em>(Note: Sub-recipients are covered when Federal funds are passed through from one recipient to a sub-recipient.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section III, page 74091)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the STA understand its responsibilities and obligations to LEP persons pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing DOT’s Title VI regulations to ensure LEP persons are not subject to discrimination? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section I, page 74089)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the STA know what part of its programs are covered by Title VI to ensure reasonable steps are taken to provide meaningful access to LEP persons? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section IX, page 74097)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the STA know or understand who is a Limited English Proficient individual? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 67, No. 117, Section IV, page 41459)</em> &amp; <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section IV, page 74091)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Four Factor Analysis</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the STA developed an individualized assessment based on the four-factor analysis? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V, page 74091)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Has the STA assessed the number of LEP persons served or likely to encountered by its programs, activities, or services? <em>(Note: Factor 1: The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by a program, activity or service of the STA or grantee.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V(1), page 74092)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Has the STA assessed the frequency with which it has, or should have contact with LEP individuals from different language groups seeking assistance? <em>(Note: Factor 2: The frequency with which LEP persons come in contact with the program.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V (2), page 74092)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Has the STA determined whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for the LEP individuals? <em>(Note: Factor 3: The nature and importance of the program, activity or service provided by the recipient to people’s lives.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V (3), page 74092)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Has the STA explored the most cost-effective means of delivering competent and accurate language services before limiting services due to resource concerns? <em>(Note: Factor 4: The resources available to the STA and costs.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V (4), page 74092)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LEP Technical Assistance Tool (TAT) has been developed in accordance with the final version of DOT’s "Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP)," dated December 14, 2005. The Policy Guidance supplants existing guidance on the same subject originally published at 66 FR 6733 (January 22, 2001).

### B. Four Factor Analysis (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the STA applied the four factors to its various kinds of contacts (different types of programs or activities in which it engages) it has with the public to assess language needs? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V, page 74091)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Language Assistance Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the STA have a “mix” of LEP services based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis? (Example: oral and written language services). <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section V (4), page 74092 and 74093)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oral Language Services: Does the STA ensure interpreters demonstrate proficiency in, and ability to communicate information accurately in both English and in the other language, and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VI (A), page 74093)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. Does the STA ensure that when interpretation services are needed they are provided in a timely manner in order to be effective? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VI (A), page 74093)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. Written Language Services: Based on the Four Factor Analysis, has the STA identified what documents should be translated? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VI (B), page 74094)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. Does the STA written translation effort follow the “Safe harbor provisions?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d. Based on the four-factor analysis, has the STA translated its vital documents into other languages? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VI (B), page 74094)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has the STA ensured that the quality and accuracy of the language service avoids potential serious consequences to the LEP person and to the STA? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII, page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the STA use family members, friends, other customers/passengers as interpreters? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VI, page 74094)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Elements of an Effective LEP Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Does the STA have an LEP implementation Plan? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII, page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. Does the STA LEP Plan contain, at a minimum, the five elements identified in the USDOT LEP guidance? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII, page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. Does the STA’s LEP Plan include information about ways in which language assistance will be provided? <em>(Example: Procedures on how to respond to LEP callers and how to respond to written communications from LEP persons.)</em> <em>(Note: Language Assistance Measures.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (2), page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the STA employees know their obligation to provide meaningful access to information and services for LEP persons? <em>(Note: Training Staff)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (3), page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c.</td>
<td>Does the STA ensure management is aware of LEP responsibilities and understands the LEP Plan so they can reinforce its importance and ensure its implementation by staff? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (3), page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d.</td>
<td>Does the STA notify LEP persons of the services available and that they are free of charge? <em>(Note: Providing Notice to LEP.)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (4), page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e.</td>
<td>Does the STA provide notices in languages LEP persons would understand? <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (4), page 74096)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f.</td>
<td>Does the STA have an ongoing process to monitor its language assistance policies and procedures at least annually to evaluate its effectiveness in serving LEP individuals and modify it accordingly? <em>(Note: Monitoring and Updating the LEP Plan)</em> <em>(Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 239, Section VII (5), page 74097)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>3 - 63</td>
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Today, I am issuing an Executive Order to help people with limited English proficiency (LEP) access Federal services. Many people who are eligible for Federal services cannot effectively use those services because they are not proficient in English. The Executive Order directs Federal agencies to improve the language-accessibility of their programs by December 11, 2000. This initiative complements our commitment to promoting programs to help individuals learn English.

I am concerned that language barriers are preventing the Federal government and recipients of Federal financial assistance from effectively serving a large number of people in this country who are eligible to participate in their programs. Failure to systematically confront language barriers can lead to unequal access to Federal benefits based on national origin and can harm the mission of Federal agencies. Breaking down these barriers will allow individuals with limited English proficiency to more fully participate in American society.

This Executive Order directs Federal agencies to break down language barriers by implementing consistent standards of language assistance across agencies and among all recipients of Federal financial assistance. Under this flexible standard, agencies and recipients must take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to their programs and activities, taking into account a variety of considerations. Among the factors to be considered are the numbers or proportion of LEP persons in the eligible service population, the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program, the nature and importance of the service provided by the program, and the available resources.
By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and to improve access to federally conducted and federally assisted programs and activities for persons who, as a result of national origin, are limited in their English proficiency (LEP), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Sec. 1. Goals.
The Federal Government provides and funds an array of services that can be made accessible to otherwise eligible persons who are not proficient in the English language. The Federal Government is committed to improving the accessibility of these services to eligible LEP persons, a goal that reinforces its equally important commitment to promoting programs and activities designed to help individuals learn English. To this end, each Federal agency shall examine the services it provides and develop and implement a system by which LEP persons can meaningfully access those services consistent with, and without unduly burdening, the fundamental mission of the agency. Each Federal agency shall also work to ensure that recipients of Federal financial assistance (recipients) provide meaningful access to their LEP applicants and beneficiaries. To assist the agencies with this endeavor, the Department of Justice has today issued a general guidance document (LEP Guidance), which sets forth the compliance standards that recipients must follow to ensure that the programs and activities they normally provide in English are accessible to LEP persons and thus do not discriminate on the basis of national origin in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and its implementing regulations. As described in the LEP Guidance, recipients must take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons.

Sec. 2. Federally Conducted Programs and Activities.
Each Federal agency shall prepare a plan to improve access to its federally conducted programs and activities by eligible LEP persons. Each plan shall be consistent with the standards set forth in the LEP Guidance, and shall include the steps the agency will take to ensure that eligible LEP persons can meaningfully access the agency’s programs and activities. Agencies shall develop and begin to implement these plans within 120 days of the date of this order, and shall send copies of their plans to the Department of Justice, which shall serve as the central repository of the agencies’ plans.

Sec. 3. Federally Assisted Programs and Activities.
Each agency providing Federal financial assistance shall draft title VI guidance specifically tailored to its recipients that is consistent with the LEP Guidance issued by the Department of Justice. This agency-specific guidance shall detail how the general standards established in the LEP Guidance will be applied to the agency’s recipients. The agency-specific guidance shall take into account the types of services provided by the recipients, the individuals served by the recipients, and other factors set out in the LEP Guidance. Agencies that already have developed title VI guidance that the Department of Justice determines is consistent with the LEP Guidance shall examine their existing guidance, as well as their programs and activities, to determine if additional guidance is necessary to comply with this order. The Department of Justice shall consult with the agencies in creating their guidance and, within 120 days of the date of this order each agency shall submit its specific guidance to the Department of Justice for review and approval. Following approval by the Department of Justice, each agency shall publish its guidance document in the Federal Register for public comment.
Section 4. Consultations.

In carrying out this order, agencies shall ensure that stakeholders, such as LEP persons and their representative organizations, recipients, and other appropriate individuals or entities, have an adequate opportunity to provide input. Agencies will evaluate the particular needs of the LEP persons they and their recipients serve and the burdens of compliance on the agency and its recipients. This input from stakeholders will assist the agencies in developing an approach to ensuring meaningful access by LEP persons that is practical and effective, fiscally responsible, responsive to the particular circumstances of each agency, and can be readily implemented.

Section 5. Judicial Review.

This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers or employees, or any person.

William J. Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 11, 2000
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

[Docket No. OST-2001-8696]

Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients' Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary (OST), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of guidance with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is publishing guidance concerning services and policies by recipients of Federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation related to persons with limited English proficiency. The guidance is based on the prohibition against national origin discrimination in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as it affects limited English proficient persons.

DATES: This guidance is effective immediately. Comments must be received on or before January 13, 2006. Late-filed comments will be considered to the extent practicable. DOT will review all comments and will determine what modifications to the guidance, if any, are necessary. This guidance supplants existing guidance on the same subject originally published at 66 FR 6733 (January 22, 2001).

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the docket number [OST-2001-8696], by any of the following methods:
- Fax: (202) 493-2251.
- Mail: Docket Management System; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590-0001.
- Hand Delivery: To the Docket Management System; Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

Instructions: You must include the agency name and docket number [OST-2001-8696] or the Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) for this notice at the beginning of your comment. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://dms.dot.gov, including any personal information provided.
**Privacy Act:** Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit [http://dms.dot.gov](http://dms.dot.gov).

**Docket:** You may view the public docket through the Internet at [http://dms.dot.gov](http://dms.dot.gov) or in person at the Docket Management System office at the above address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joseph Austin, Chief, External Policy and Program Development Division, Departmental Office of Civil Rights, Telephone: (202) 366-5992, TTY: (202) 366-9696, E-mail: joseph.austin@dot.gov; or Bonnie Angermann, Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Telephone: (202) 366-9166, E-mail: bonnie.angermann@dot.gov. Arrangements to receive the policy guidance in an alternative format may be made by contacting the named individuals.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq., and its implementing regulations provide that no person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin under any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance. The purpose of this limited English proficiency policy guidance is to clarify the responsibilities of recipients of Federal financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) (``recipients``), and assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities to limited English proficient (LEP) persons, pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing regulations.

Executive Order 13166, ``Improving Access to Services for Persons With Limited English Proficiency,'' reprinted at 65 FR 50121 (August 16, 2000), directs each Federal agency that is subject to the requirements of Title VI to publish guidance for its respective recipients clarifying that obligation.

Executive Order 13166 further directs that all such guidance documents be consistent with the compliance standards and framework detailed in the Department of Justice's (DOJ's) Policy Guidance entitled ``Enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964--National Origin Discrimination Against Persons With Limited English Proficiency.'' See 65 FR 50123 (August 16, 2000) (DOJ's General LEP Guidance).

DOT published its initial guidance regarding its recipients' obligations to take reasonable steps to ensure access by LEP persons on January 22, 2001, and requested public comment on the guidance. See 66 FR 6733. DOT received 21 comments in response to its January 22, 2001, policy guidance. The comments reflected the views of individuals, organizations serving LEP populations, organizations favoring the use of the English language, and recipient agencies. While many comments identified areas for improvement and/or revision, the majority of the comments on the DOT LEP Guidance expressed agreement with its overall goal of ensuring access of LEP individuals to recipients’ services. DOT worked closely with DOJ to ensure that recipients’ comments were addressed in a consistent fashion.

In the order most often raised, the common areas of comment regarded: cost considerations, especially for smaller recipients serving few LEP persons; increased litigation risk and liability for recipients as a result of the guidance; and use of interpreters and the definition of ``qualified interpreter."

A large number of comments focused on cost considerations and suggested that the Department address them as part of its evaluation of the language assistance needs of LEP persons. Particularly, this concern was expressed by State agencies that at the time received Coast Guard grants to administer safe boating courses.1 But this policy guidance does not require DOT recipients to translate all courses or materials in every circumstance or to take unreasonable or burdensome steps in providing LEP persons access. We have clarified the guidance to better convey its flexibility, based on the four-factor analysis set forth in DOJ's General LEP Guidance.

---

1 This guidance does not address the extent to which Executive Order 13166 requires language access services in the provision of boating safety courses funded by the Coast Guard, because that agency is no longer a component of the Department of Transportation.
Several recipients commented that they serve few if any LEP persons and that the cost of interpreting all of their courses and materials would be excessive and unnecessary. While none urged that costs be excluded from consideration altogether, at least one comment expressed concern that a recipient could use cost as a basis for avoiding otherwise reasonable and necessary language assistance to LEP persons. In contrast, a few comments suggested that the flexible fact-dependent compliance standard set forth in the guidance, when combined with the desire of most recipients to avoid the risk of noncompliance, could lead some large recipients to incur unnecessary or inappropriate fiscal burdens in the face of already strained program budgets.

The Department is mindful that cost considerations could be inappropriately used to avoid providing otherwise reasonable and necessary language assistance. Similarly, cost considerations could be ignored or minimized to justify the provision of a particular level or type of language service even though effective alternatives exist at a minimal cost. The Department also is aware of the possibility that satisfying the need for language services might be quite costly for certain types of recipients, particularly if they have not updated their programs and activities to the changing needs of the populations they serve.

The potential for some recipients to assert adverse cost impacts in order to avoid Title VI obligations does not, in the Department's view, justify eliminating cost as a factor in all cases when determining the necessary scope of reasonable language assistance services under DOT's guidance. The Department continues to believe that costs are a legitimate consideration in identifying the reasonableness of particular language assistance measures, and the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance identifies the appropriate framework through which costs are to be considered. See Department of Justice Final Guidance to Federal Financial Assistance Recipients Regarding Title VI Prohibition Against National Origin Discrimination Affecting Limited English Proficient Persons, 67 FR 41455 (June 18, 2002).

The second most common category of comments DOT received expressed concern over increased litigation risk and liability for recipients as a result of the LEP Guidance. As is addressed below in the Introduction, Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001), holds principally that there is no private right of action to enforce Title VI disparate impact regulations. The LEP Guidance is based on Title VI and DOT's Title VI regulations at 49 CFR part 21 and does not provide any private right of action beyond that which exists in those laws. Thus, the LEP Guidance does not increase the risk of recipients' legal liability to private plaintiffs. However, the Department does not dismiss the possibility that individuals may continue to initiate such legal actions.

The third most numerous category of comments DOT received regarded the definition of "qualified interpreter" and expressed commentators' concern with recipients' responsibility to make interpreters available, especially for recipients who serve populations with extremely diverse language needs. Set forth below in section VI are practices to help recipients ascertain that their interpreters are both competent and effective. This section should enable recipients to assess the qualifications of the interpreters they use and identify any improvements that need to be addressed.

Three of the comments urged withdrawal of the guidance, arguing it is unsupported by law. In response, the Department notes that its commitment to implementing Title VI and its regulations to address language barriers is longstanding and is unaffected by recent judicial action precluding individuals from successfully maintaining suits to enforce agencies' Title VI disparate impact regulations. This guidance clarifies existing statutory and regulatory provisions by describing the factors recipients should consider in fulfilling their responsibilities to LEP persons.

The remaining 18 comments were generally supportive of the guidance and DOT's leadership in this area. One recipient commented that constraining LEP persons' access to services may actually hinder their ability to become more proficient in the English language, therefore justifying increased programs for LEP persons. Several comments received addressed areas unique to the provision of transportation services to LEP persons. One recipient discussed the inconsistency between the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA's) regulations requiring all drivers to speak and understand a certain amount of English, and the guidance's requirement that the FMCSA division offices provide information and services in other languages to accommodate LEP persons. Pursuant to 49 CFR 391.11(b)(2), a person is qualified to drive a motor vehicle if he or she
can read and speak the English language sufficiently to converse with the general public, to understand highway traffic signs and signals in the English language, to respond to official inquiries, and to make entries on reports and records.” In 1997, following an

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) legal challenge to this requirement, DOT issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) to address this issue. On July 24, 2003, FMCSA withdrew this ANPRM, concluding that the information introduced in response to the notice does not establish that the current regulation requires an unnecessarily high level of English fluency that has resulted in a discriminatory impact or effect based upon national origin, color, or ethnicity.” FMCSA determined the regulation “as written and properly enforced effectively balances issues of civil rights and highway safety.” 68 FR 43890.

- Coverage extends to a recipient's entire program or activity, i.e., to all parts of a recipient's operations. This is true even if only one part of the recipient receives the Federal assistance.
- Example: DOT provides assistance to a State department of transportation to rehabilitate a particular highway on the National Highway System. All of the operations of the entire State department of transportation—not just the particular highway program—are covered by the DOT guidance.
- Finally, some recipients operate in jurisdictions in which English has been declared the official language. Nonetheless, these recipients continue to be subject to Federal nondiscrimination requirements, including those applicable to the provision of federally assisted services to persons with limited English proficiency.

Another recipient, who works with community-based organizations concerned with transportation practices and policies, suggested mandatory LEP Access Assessments be attached to the standard financial assistance Assurance Forms that recipients must execute, to serve as a basis for disqualifying recipients submitting inaccurate or substantially incomplete assessments from Federal grant funding. While providing LEP persons with meaningful access is the law and should be given high priority, DOT advocates a flexible approach in ensuring such access, as outlined below in section V, in order to suit the varying needs of its recipients, and therefore has not adopted this suggestion. As discussed in section VIII, DOT seeks to promote voluntary compliance to meet Title VI's goal of ensuring that Federal funds are not used in a manner that discriminates on the basis of race, color, or national origin. DOT will work with recipients to meet this goal, and will resort to more intrusive administrative remedies only if voluntary compliance cannot be secured and stronger measures become necessary to ensure LEP persons have meaningful access to services from recipients of DOT financial assistance.

This document has been modified based on careful consideration of public comments received by DOT, and the approach DOJ adopted after analyzing the public comments it received following its initial guidance published at 66 FR 3834 (January 16, 2001). This guidance is consistent with: Title VI, implementing regulations, Executive Order 13166, the DOJ General LEP Guidance, and the model DOJ Recipient Guidance issued on June 18, 2002.

With particular emphasis on the concerns mentioned above, the Department proposes this “Limited English Proficiency Guidance for Department of Transportation Recipients.” The text of this guidance document appears below.

Because this guidance must adhere to the Federal-wide compliance standards and framework detailed in the model DOJ Recipient Guidance issued on June 18, 2002, DOT specifically solicits comments on the nature, scope, and appropriateness of the DOT-specific examples set out in this guidance explaining and/or highlighting how those consistent Federal-wide compliance standards are applicable to recipients of Federal financial assistance from DOT. This guidance supplants the existing guidance on the same subject published at 66 FR 6733 (January 22, 2001). This guidance does not constitute a regulation subject to the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553.

Dated: December 7, 2005.

J. Michael Trujillo,
Director, Departmental Office of Civil Rights.

I. Introduction

Most individuals living in the United States read, write, speak, and understand English. There are many individuals, however, for whom English is not their primary language. For instance, based on the 2000 census, regarding individuals older than age 5, over 26 million individuals speak Spanish and almost 7 million individuals speak an Asian or Pacific Island language at home. If these individuals have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English, they are limited English proficient, or "LEP." In a 2001 Supplementary Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau, 33% of Spanish speakers and 22.4% of all Asian and Pacific Island language speakers aged 18-64 reported that they spoke English either "not well" or "not at all.

Language for LEP individuals can be a barrier to accessing important benefits or services, understanding and exercising important rights, complying with applicable responsibilities, or understanding other information provided by federally funded programs and activities. The Federal Government funds an array of services that can be made meaningfully accessible to otherwise eligible LEP persons. The Federal Government is committed to improving the accessibility of these programs and activities to eligible LEP persons, a goal that reinforces its equally important commitment to promoting programs and activities designed to help individuals learn English. Recipients of Federal financial assistance have an obligation to reduce language barriers that can preclude meaningful access by LEP persons to important government services.

In certain circumstances, failure to ensure that LEP persons can effectively participate in or benefit from federally assisted programs and activities may violate the prohibition under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, and Title VI regulations against national origin discrimination. The purpose of this policy guidance is to assist recipients in fulfilling their responsibilities to provide meaningful access to LEP persons under existing law. This guidance clarifies existing legal requirements for LEP persons by describing the factors recipients should consider in fulfilling their responsibilities to LEP persons. These are the same criteria DOT will use in evaluating whether recipients are complying with Title VI and Title VI regulations.

Executive Order 13166 charges DOJ with the responsibility for providing LEP Guidance to other Federal agencies, such as DOT, and for ensuring consistency among each agency-specific guidance. Consistency among Federal Government agencies is particularly important. Inconsistent or contradictory guidance could confuse recipients of Federal funds and needlessly increase costs without facilitating the meaningful access for LEP persons that this policy guidance is designed to address. As with most government initiatives, this requires balancing several principles.

While this guidance discusses that balance in some detail, it is important to note the basic principles behind that balance. First, we must ensure that federally assisted programs and activities aimed at the American public do not leave individuals behind simply because they face challenges communicating in English. This is of particular importance because, in many cases, LEP individuals form a substantial portion of those who particularly benefit from federally assisted programs and activities.

---


3 DOT recognizes that many recipients had language assistance programs in place prior to the issuance of Executive Order 13166. This policy guidance provides a uniform framework for a recipient to integrate, formalize, and assess the continued vitality of these existing and possibly additional reasonable efforts based on the nature of its programs and activities, the current needs of the LEP populations it encounters, and its prior experience in providing language services in the community it serves.

4 This policy guidance is not a regulation but rather a guide. Title VI and its implementing regulations require that recipients take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons. Recipients should use the guidance to determine how best to comply with statutory and regulatory obligations to provide meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are LEP.
Second, we must achieve this goal while finding constructive methods to reduce the costs of LEP requirements on small businesses, small local governments, or small nonprofit organizations that receive Federal financial assistance. There are many productive steps that the Federal Government, either collectively or as individual agencies, can take to help recipients reduce the costs of language services without sacrificing meaningful access for LEP persons. Without these steps, certain smaller recipients may choose not to participate in federally assisted programs or activities, threatening the critical functions that the programs or activities strive to assist. To that end, DOT plans to continue to work with DOJ and other Federal agencies to provide ongoing assistance and guidance in this important area. In addition, DOT plans to work with recipients of Federal financial assistance—for example, with motor vehicle departments, transit authorities, State departments of transportation, and other transportation service providers—and LEP persons, to identify and share model plans, examples of best practices, and cost-saving approaches. Moreover, DOT intends to explore how language assistance measures and cost-containment approaches developed with respect to its own federally conducted programs and activities can be effectively shared or otherwise made available to recipients, particularly small businesses, small local governments, and small nonprofit organizations. An interagency working group on LEP has developed a Web site, http://www.lep.gov, to assist in disseminating this information to recipients, Federal agencies, and the communities being served.

Many commentators have noted that some have interpreted the case of Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001), as impliedly striking down the regulations promulgated under Title VI that form the basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities. We have taken the position that this is not the case, and will continue to do so. Accordingly, we will strive to ensure that federally assisted programs and activities work in a way that is effective for all eligible beneficiaries, including those with limited English proficiency.

II. Legal Authority

Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, provides that no person shall "on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Section 602 authorizes and directs Federal agencies that are empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity "to effectuate the provisions of [section 601] * * * by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability." 42 U.S.C. 2000d-1.

Department of Justice regulations promulgated pursuant to section 602 forbid recipients from "utiliz[ing] criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin." 28 CFR 42.104(b)(2). DOT's Title VI regulations include almost identical language in this regard. See 49 CFR 21.5(b)(vii)(2) (portions of these regulations are provided in Appendix A).

The Supreme Court, in Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), interpreted regulations promulgated by the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including a regulation similar to that of DOJ, 45 CFR 80.3(b)(2), to hold that Title VI prohibits conduct that has a disproportionate effect on LEP persons because such conduct constitutes national origin discrimination. In Lau, a San Francisco school district that had a significant number of non-English-speaking students of Chinese origin was required to take reasonable steps to provide them with a meaningful opportunity to participate in federally funded educational programs.

On August 11, 2000, Executive Order 13166 was issued. "Improving Access to Services for Persons With Limited English Proficiency," 65 FR 50121 (August 16, 2000). Under that order, every Federal agency that provides financial assistance to non-Federal entities must publish guidance on how its recipients can provide meaningful access to LEP persons and thus comply with Title VI regulations forbidding recipients from "restrict [ing] an individual in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program" or from "utiliz[ing] criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin."

Subsequently, Federal agencies raised questions regarding the requirements of the Executive Order, especially in light of the Supreme Court's decision in Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001). On October 26, 2001, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights issued a memorandum for "Heads of Departments and Agencies, General Counsels and Civil Rights Directors." This memorandum clarified and reaffirmed the DOJ LEP Guidance in light of Sandoval. The Assistant Attorney General stated that because Sandoval did not invalidate any Title VI regulations that proscribe conduct that has a disparate impact on covered groups—the types of regulations that form the legal basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities—the Executive Order remains in force.5

Pursuant to Executive Order 13166, DOT developed its own guidance document for recipients and initially issued it on January 22, 2001. "DOT Guidance to Recipients on Special Language Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Beneficiaries." However, in light of the public comments received and the Assistant Attorney General's October 26, 2001, clarifying memorandum, DOT has revised its LEP guidance to ensure greater consistency with DOJ's revised LEP guidance, published June 18, 2002, and other agencies' revised LEP guidance. 67 FR 117 (June 18, 2002).

III. Who Is Covered?

Pursuant to Executive Order 13166, the meaningful access requirement of Title VI, the Title VI regulations, and the four-factor analysis set forth in the DOJ's revised LEP Guidance, 67 FR 117 (June 18, 2002), apply to the programs and activities of Federal agencies, including DOT. Federal financial assistance includes grants, cooperative agreements, training, use of equipment, donations of surplus property, and other assistance. Recipients of DOT assistance include, for example:

- State departments of transportation.
- State motor vehicle administrations.
- Airport operators.
- State highway safety programs.
- Metropolitan planning organizations.
- Regional transportation agencies.
- Regional, state, and local transit operators.
- Public safety agencies.6

5 The memorandum noted that some commentators have interpreted Sandoval as impliedly striking down the disparate impact regulations promulgated under Title VI that form the basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities. See, e.g., Sandoval, 532 U.S. at 286, 286 n.6 ("We assume for purposes of this decision that section 602 confers the authority to promulgate disparate-impact regulations; * * * We cannot help observing, however, how strange it is to say that disparate-impact regulations are 'inspired by, at the service of, and inseparably intertwined with' Sec. 601 * * * when Sec. 601 permits the very behavior that the regulations forbid"). The memorandum, however, made clear that DOJ disagreed with the commentators' interpretation. Sandoval holds principally that there is no private right of action to enforce Title VI disparate impact regulations. It did not address the validity of those regulations or Executive Order 13166 or otherwise limit the authority and responsibility of Federal agencies to enforce their own Title VI regulations.

6 Recipients should review DOJ's LEP Guidance for specific examples of how the four-factor analysis applies to interactions between funded law enforcement authorities and first responders.
• Hazardous materials transporters and other first responders.
• State and local agencies with emergency transportation responsibilities, for example, the transportation of supplies for natural disasters, planning for evacuations, quarantines, and other similar action.
• Sub-recipients likewise are covered when Federal funds are passed through from one recipient to a sub-recipient.

Coverage extends to a recipient's entire program or activity, i.e., to all parts of a recipient's operations. This is true even if only one part of the recipient receives the Federal assistance.

Example: DOT provides assistance to a State department of transportation to rehabilitate a particular highway on the National Highway System. All of the operations of the entire State department of transportation—not just the particular highway program—are covered by the DOT guidance.

Finally, some recipients operate in jurisdictions in which English has been declared the official language. Nonetheless, these recipients continue to be subject to Federal nondiscrimination requirements, including those applicable to the provision of federally assisted services to persons with limited English proficiency.

IV. Who Is a Limited English Proficient Individual?

Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English can be limited English proficient, or “LEP,” and, therefore, are entitled to language assistance under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to a particular type of service, benefit, or encounter. However, if a Federal agency were to decide to terminate Federal funds based on noncompliance with Title VI or its regulations, only funds directed to the particular program or activity that is out of compliance would be terminated. 42 U.S.C. 2000d-1.

Examples of populations likely to include LEP persons who are served or encountered by DOT recipients and should be considered when planning language services include, but are not limited to:

• Public transportation passengers.
• Persons who apply for a driver's license at a State department of motor vehicles.
• Persons subject to the control of State or local transportation enforcement authorities, including, for example, commercial motor vehicle drivers.
• Persons served by emergency transportation response programs.
• Persons living in areas affected or potentially affected by transportation projects.
• Business owners who apply to participate in DOT's
• Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.

V. How Does a Recipient Determine the Extent of Its Obligation to Provide LEP Services?

Recipients are required to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons. While designed to be a flexible and fact-dependent standard, the starting point is an individualized assessment that balances the following four factors: (1) The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by a program, activity, or service of the recipient or grantee; (2) the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program; (3) the nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the recipient to people's lives; and (4) the resources available to the recipient and costs. As indicated above, the intent of this policy guidance is to suggest a balance that ensures meaningful access by LEP persons to critical services while not imposing undue burdens on small businesses, small local governments, or small nonprofit organizations.

After applying the above four-factor analysis to the various kinds of contacts a recipient has with the public, the recipient may conclude that different language assistance measures are sufficient to ensure meaningful access to the different types of programs or activities in which it engages. For instance, some of a recipient's activities will have a greater impact on or contact with LEP persons than others, and thus may require more in the way of language assistance. The flexibility that recipients have in addressing the needs of the LEP populations they serve does not diminish, and should not be used to minimize, the obligation that those needs be addressed.
DOT recipients should apply the following four factors to the various kinds of contacts that they have with the public to assess language needs and decide what reasonable steps they should take to ensure meaningful access for LEP persons.

(1) The Number or Proportion of LEP Persons Served or Encountered in the Eligible Service Population

The greater the number or proportion of LEP persons from a particular language group served or encountered in the eligible service population, the more likely language services are needed. Ordinarily, persons “eligible to be served, or likely to be directly affected, by” a recipient's programs or activities are those who are in fact, served or encountered in the eligible service population. This population will be program-specific, and includes persons who are in the geographic area that is part of the recipient's service area. However, where, for instance, a motor vehicle office serves a large LEP population, the appropriate service area is that served by the office, and not the entire population served by the department. Where no service area has previously been approved, the relevant service area may be that which is approved by State or local authorities or designated by the recipient itself, provided that these designations do not themselves discriminatorily exclude certain populations. When considering the number or proportion of LEP individuals in a service area, recipients should consider LEP parent(s) whose English proficient or LEP minor children and dependents encounter the services of DOT recipients.

Recipients should first examine their prior experiences with LEP individuals and determine the breadth and scope of language services that are needed. In conducting this analysis, it is important to: Include language minority populations that are eligible beneficiaries of recipients’ programs, activities, or services but may be underserved because of existing language barriers; and consult additional data, for example, from the census, school systems and community organizations, and data from State and local governments, community agencies, school systems, religious organizations, and legal aid entities.  

(2) The Frequency With Which LEP Individuals Come in Contact With the Program, Activity, or Service

Recipients should assess, as accurately as possible, the frequency with which they have or should have contact with LEP individuals from different language groups seeking assistance, as the more frequent the contact, the more likely enhanced language services will be needed. The steps that are reasonable for a recipient that serves an LEP person on a one-time basis will be very different than those expected from a recipient that serves LEP persons daily. Recipients should also consider the frequency of different types of language contacts, as frequent contacts with Spanish-speaking people who are LEP may require certain assistance in Spanish, while less frequent contact with different language groups may suggest a different and/or less intensified solution. If an LEP individual accesses a program or service on a daily basis, a recipient has greater duties than if the same individual's program or activity contact is unpredictable or infrequent. However, even recipients that serve LEP persons on an unpredictable or infrequent basis should use this balancing analysis to determine what to do if an LEP individual seeks services under the program in question. This plan need not be intricate. It may be as simple as being prepared to use a commercial telephonic interpretation service to obtain immediate interpreter services. Additionally, in applying this standard, recipients should consider whether appropriate outreach to LEP persons could increase the frequency of contact with LEP language groups.

---

7 The focus of the analysis is on lack of English proficiency, not the ability to speak more than one language. Note that demographic data may indicate the most frequently spoken languages other than English and the percentage of people who speak that language but speak or understand English less than well. People who are also proficient in English may speak some of the most commonly spoken languages other than English.
(3) The Nature and Importance of the Program, Activity, or Service Provided by the Program

The more important the activity, information, service, or program, or the greater the possible consequences of the contact to the LEP individuals, the more likely language services are needed. The obligations to communicate rights to an LEP person who needs public transportation differ, for example, from those to provide recreational programming. A recipient needs to determine whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for the LEP individual. Decisions by a Federal, State, or local entity to make an activity compulsory, such as requiring a driver to have a license, can serve as strong evidence of the importance of the program or activity.

(4) The Resources Available to the Recipient and Costs

A recipient's level of resources and the costs imposed may have an impact on the nature of the steps it should take in providing meaningful access for LEP persons. Smaller recipients with more limited budgets are not expected to provide the same level of language services as larger recipients with larger budgets. In addition, "reasonable steps" may cease to be reasonable where the costs imposed substantially exceed the benefits. Recipients should carefully explore the most cost-effective means of delivering competent and accurate language services before limiting services due to resource concerns.

Resource and cost issues, however, can often be reduced by technological advances, reasonable business practices, and the sharing of language assistance materials and services among and between recipients, advocacy groups, affected populations, and Federal agencies. For example, the following practices may reduce resource and cost issues where appropriate:

- Training bilingual staff to act as interpreters and translators.
- Information sharing through industry groups.
- Telephonic and video conferencing interpretation services.
- Translating vital documents posted on Web sites.
- Pooling resources and standardizing documents to reduce translation needs.
- Using qualified translators and interpreters to ensure that documents need not be "fixed" later and that inaccurate interpretations do not cause delay or other costs.
- Centralizing interpreter and translator services to achieve economies of scale.
- Formalized use of qualified community volunteers.

Large entities and those entities serving a significant number or proportion of LEP persons should ensure that their resource limitations are well substantiated before using this factor as a reason to limit language assistance. Such recipients may find it useful to be able to articulate, through documentation or in some other reasonable manner, their process for determining that language services would be limited based on resources or costs.

This four-factor analysis necessarily implicates the "mix" of LEP services required. Recipients have two main ways to provide language services: Oral interpretation either in person or via telephone interpretation service (hereinafter "interpretation") and written translation (hereinafter "translation"). Oral interpretation can range from on-site interpreters for critical services provided to a high volume of LEP persons to access through commercially available telephonic interpretation services. Written translation, likewise, can range from translation of an entire document to translation of a short description of the document. In some cases, language services should be made available on an expedited basis while in others the LEP individual may be referred to another office of the recipient for language assistance.

The correct mix should be based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis. For instance, a motor vehicle department or an emergency hazardous material clean-up team in a largely Hispanic neighborhood may need immediate oral interpreters available and should give serious consideration to hiring bilingual staff (of course, many such departments have already made these arrangements). Additionally, providing public

---

8 Small recipients with limited resources may find that entering into a bulk telephonic interpretation service contract will prove cost effective.
transportation access to LEP persons is crucial. An LEP person's inability to utilize effectively public transportation may adversely affect his or her ability to obtain health care, or education, or access to employment. In contrast, there may be circumstances where the importance and nature of the activity and number or proportion and frequency of contact with LEP persons may be low and the costs and resources needed to provide language services may be high—such as in the case of a voluntary general public tour of an airport or train station—in which pre-arranged language services for the particular service may not be necessary. Regardless of the type of language services provided, quality and accuracy of those services can be critical. Recipients have substantial flexibility in determining the appropriate mix.

VI. Selecting Language Assistance Services

Recipients may provide language services in either oral or written form. Quality and accuracy of the language service is critical in order to avoid potential serious consequences to the LEP person and to the recipient.

A. Oral Language Services (Interpretation)

Interpretation is the act of listening to something in one language (source language) and orally translating it into another language (target language). Where interpretation is needed and is reasonable, recipients should consider some or all of the options below for providing competent interpreters in a timely manner.

Competence of Interpreters. When providing oral assistance, recipients should ensure competency of the language service provider, no matter which of the strategies outlined below are used. Competency requires more than self-identification as bilingual. Some bilingual staff and community volunteers, for instance, may be able to communicate effectively in a different language when communicating information directly in that language, but not be competent to interpret into and out of English. Likewise, they may not be able to do written translations.

Competency to interpret, however, does not necessarily mean formal certification as an interpreter, although certification is helpful. When using interpreters, recipients should ensure that they:

Demonstrate proficiency in and ability to communicate information accurately in both English and in the other language and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting (e.g., consecutive, simultaneous, summarization, or sight translation).

Have knowledge in both languages of any specialized terms or concepts peculiar to the recipient’s program or activity and of any particularized vocabulary and phraseology used by the LEP person;9 and understand and follow confidentiality and impartiality rules to the same extent as the recipient employee for whom they are interpreting and/or to the extent their position requires.

Understand and adhere to their role as interpreters without deviating into a role as counselor, legal advisor, or other roles.

Additionally, some recipients may have their own requirements for interpreters, as individual rights may depend on precise, complete, and accurate interpretations or translations. In some cases, interpreters may be required to demonstrate that their involvement in a matter would not create a conflict of interest.

9 Many languages have “regionalisms,” or differences in usage. For instance, a word that may be understood to mean something in Spanish for someone from Cuba may not be so understood by someone from Mexico. In addition, because there may be languages that do not have an appropriate direct interpretation of certain legal terms, the interpreter should be able to provide the most appropriate interpretation. The interpreter should make the recipient aware of the issue and the interpreter and recipient can then work to develop a consistent and appropriate set of descriptions of these terms in that language that can be used again, when appropriate.
While quality and accuracy of language services are critical, they are nonetheless part of the appropriate mix of LEP services required. The quality and accuracy of language services as part of disaster relief programs, or in the provision of emergency supplies and services, for example, must be extraordinarily high, while the quality and accuracy of language services in a bicycle safety course need not meet the same exacting standards.

Finally, when interpretation is needed and is reasonable, it should be provided in a timely manner in order to be effective. Generally, to be "timely," the recipient should provide language assistance at a time and place that avoids the effective denial of the service, benefit, or right at issue or the imposition of an undue burden on or delay in important rights, benefits, or services to the LEP person. For example, when the timeliness of services is important, such as when an LEP person needs access to public transportation, a DOT recipient does not provide meaningful LEP access when it has only one bilingual staff member available one day a week to provide the service.

Hiring Bilingual Staff. When particular languages are encountered often, hiring bilingual staff offers one of the best, and often most economical, options. Recipients can, for example, fill public contact positions, such as transit station managers, department of motor vehicle service representatives, security guards, or program directors, with staff that are bilingual and competent to communicate directly with LEP persons in their language. If bilingual staff members are also used to interpret between English speakers and LEP persons, or to orally interpret written documents from English into another language, they should be competent in the skill of interpreting, as discussed above. Effective management strategies, including any appropriate adjustments in assignments and protocols for using bilingual staff, can ensure that bilingual staff members are fully and appropriately utilized. When bilingual staff cannot meet all of the language service obligations of the recipient, the recipient should turn to other options.

Hiring Staff Interpreters. Hiring interpreters may be most helpful where there is a frequent need for interpreting services in one or more languages. Depending on the facts, sometimes it may be necessary and reasonable to provide on-site interpreters to facilitate accurate and meaningful communication with an LEP person.

Contracting for Interpreters. Contract interpreters may be a cost-effective option when there is no regular need for a particular language skill. In addition to commercial and other private providers, many community-based organizations and mutual assistance associations provide interpretation services for particular languages. Contracting with interpreters and providing training regarding the recipient's programs and processes to these organizations can be a cost-effective option for providing language services to LEP persons from those language groups.

Using Telephone Interpreter Lines. Telephone interpreter service lines often offer prompt interpreting assistance in many different languages. They may be particularly appropriate where the mode of communicating with an English proficient person would also be over the phone. Although telephonic interpretation services are useful in many situations, it is important to ensure that, when using such services, the interpreters are competent to interpret any technical or legal terms specific to a particular program that may be important parts of the conversation. Nuances in language and non-verbal communication can often assist an interpreter and cannot be recognized over the phone. The issues discussed above regarding interpreter competency are also relevant to telephonic interpreters. Video teleconferencing and allowing interpreters to review relevant documents in advance may also be helpful.

Using Community Volunteers. In addition to consideration of bilingual staff, staff interpreters, or contract interpreters (either in-person or by telephone) as options to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons, use of recipient-coordinated community volunteers may provide a cost-effective supplemental language assistance strategy under appropriate circumstances. They may be particularly useful in providing language access for a recipient's less critical programs and activities. To the extent the recipient relies on community volunteers, it is often best to use volunteers who are trained in the information or services of the program and can communicate directly with...
LEP persons in their language. Just as with all interpreters, community volunteers used to interpret between English speakers and LEP persons, or to orally translate documents, should be competent in the skill of interpreting and knowledgeable about applicable confidentiality and impartiality rules. Recipients should consider formal arrangements with community-based organizations that provide volunteers to address these concerns and help ensure that services are available more regularly.

Use of Family Members, Friends, Other Customers/Passengers as Interpreters. Although recipients should not plan to rely on an LEP person's family members, friends, or other informal interpreters to provide meaningful access to important programs and activities, where LEP persons so desire, they should be permitted to use an interpreter of their choice at their own expense (whether a professional interpreter, family member, or friend) in place of or as a supplement to the free language services expressly offered by the recipient. LEP persons may feel more comfortable when a trusted family member or friend acts as an interpreter. In addition, in exigent circumstances that are not reasonably foreseeable, temporary use of interpreters not provided by the recipient may be necessary. However, with proper planning and implementation, recipients should be able to avoid most such situations.

Recipients, however, should take special care to ensure that family members, legal guardians, caretakers, and other informal interpreters are appropriate in light of the circumstances and subject matter of the program, service or activity, including protection of the recipient's own administrative, mission-related, or enforcement interest in accurate interpretation. In many circumstances, family members (especially children) or friends are not competent to provide quality and accurate interpretations. Issues of confidentiality, privacy, or conflict of interest may also arise. LEP individuals may feel uncomfortable revealing or describing sensitive or confidential information to a family member, friend, or member of the local community. In addition, such informal interpreters may have a personal connection to the LEP person or an undisclosed conflict of interest, such as the desire to obtain an LEP person's personal identification information, for example, in the case of an LEP person attempting to apply for a driver's license. Thus, DOT recipients should generally offer free interpreter services to the LEP person. This is particularly true in situations in which health, safety, or access to important benefits and services are at stake, or when credibility and accuracy are important to protect an individual's rights and access to important services.

An example of such a case is when no interpreters, or bilingual or symbolic signs are available in a State department of motor vehicles. In an effort to apply for a driver's license, vehicle registration, or parking permit, an LEP person may be forced to enlist the help of a stranger for translation. This practice may raise serious issues of competency or confidentiality and may compromise the personal security of the LEP person, as the stranger could have access to the LEP person's personal identification information, such as his or her name, phone number, address, social security number, driver's license number (if different from the social security number), and medical information. However, there are situations where proper application of the four factors would lead to a conclusion that recipient-provided services are not necessary. An example of this is a voluntary educational tour of an airport, or a train or bus station. There, the importance and nature of the activity may be relatively low and unlikely to implicate issues of confidentiality, conflict of interest, or the need for accuracy. In addition, the resources needed and costs of providing language services may be high. In such a setting, an LEP person's use of family, friends, or others to interpret may be appropriate.

If the LEP person voluntarily chooses to provide his or her own interpreter, a recipient should consider whether a record of that choice and of the recipient's offer of assistance is appropriate. Where precise, complete, and accurate interpretations or translations of information and/or testimony are critical, or where the competency of the LEP person's interpreter is not established, a recipient might decide to provide its own, independent interpreter, even if an LEP person wants to use his or her own interpreter as well. Extra caution should be exercised when the LEP person chooses to use a minor as the interpreter. While the LEP person's decision should be respected, there may be additional issues of competency, confidentiality, or conflict of interest when the choice involves using children as interpreters. The recipient should take care to ensure that the LEP person's choice is voluntary, that the LEP person is aware of the possible problems if the preferred interpreter is a minor child, and that the LEP person knows that a competent interpreter could be provided by the recipient at no cost.
B. Written Language Services (Translation)

Translation is the replacement of a written text from one language (source language) into an equivalent written text in another language (target language).

What Documents Should be Translated? After applying the four-factor analysis, a recipient may determine that an effective LEP plan for its particular program or activity includes the translation of vital written materials into the language of each frequently encountered LEP group eligible to be served and/or likely to be affected by the recipient's program. Such written materials could include, for example:

- Driver's license, automobile registration, and parking permit forms.
- Parking tickets, citation forms, and violation or deficiency notices, or pertinent portions thereof.
- Emergency transportation information.
- Markings, signs, and packaging for hazardous materials and substances.
- Signs in bus and train stations, and in airports.
- Notices of public hearings regarding recipients' proposed transportation plans, projects, or changes, and reduction, denial, or termination of services or benefits.
- Signs in waiting rooms, reception areas, and other initial points of entry.
- Notices advising LEP persons of free language assistance and language identification cards for staff (i.e., "I speak" cards).
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- Statements about the services available and the right to free language assistance services in appropriate non-English languages, in brochures, booklets, outreach and recruitment information, and other materials routinely disseminated to the public.
- Written tests that do not assess English-language competency, but test competency for a particular license, job, or skill for which knowing English is not required.
- Applications, or instructions on how to participate in a recipient's program or activity or to receive recipient benefits or services.
- Consent forms.

Whether or not a document (or the information it solicits) is "vital" may depend upon the importance of the program, information, encounter, or service involved, and the consequence to the LEP person if the information in question is not accurate or timely. For instance, applications for bicycle safety courses should not generally be considered vital, whereas access to safe driving handbooks could be considered vital. Where appropriate, recipients are encouraged to create a plan for consistently determining, over time and across their various activities, what documents are "vital" to the meaningful access of the LEP populations they serve.

Classifying a document as vital or non-vital is sometimes difficult, especially in the case of outreach materials like brochures or other information on rights and services. Awareness of rights or services is an important part of "meaningful access," as lack of awareness may effectively deny LEP individuals meaningful access. Thus, where a recipient is engaged in community outreach efforts in furtherance of its programs and activities, it should regularly assess Thus, where a recipient is engaged in community outreach efforts in furtherance of its programs and activities, it should regularly assess the needs of the populations frequently encountered or affected by the program or activity to determine whether certain critical outreach materials should be translated. Community organizations may be helpful in determining what outreach materials may be most helpful to translate, and some such translations may be made more effective when done in tandem with other outreach methods, including utilizing the ethnic media, schools, and religious and community organizations to spread a message.

Sometimes a very large document may include both vital and non-vital information. This may also be the case when the title and a phone number for obtaining more information on the contents of the document in frequently encountered languages other than English is critical, but the document is sent out to the general public and
cannot reasonably be translated into many languages. Thus, vital information may include, for instance, providing information in appropriate languages regarding where an LEP person might obtain an interpretation or translation of the document.

Into What Languages Should Documents be Translated? The extent of the recipient's obligation to provide written translations of documents should be determined by the recipient on a case-by-case basis, looking at the totality of the circumstances in light of the four-factor analysis. Because translation is a one-time expense, consideration should be given to whether the upfront cost of translating a document (as opposed to oral interpretation) should be amortized over the likely lifespan of the document when applying this four-factor analysis.

The languages spoken by the LEP individuals with whom the recipient has frequent contact determine the languages into which vital documents should be translated. However, because many DOT recipients serve communities in large cities or across an entire State and regularly serve areas with LEP populations that speak dozens and sometimes more than 100 languages, it would be unrealistic to translate all written materials into each language. Although recent technological advances have made it easier for recipients to store and share translated documents, such an undertaking would incur substantial costs and require substantial resources. However, well-substantiated claims of lack of resources to translate all such documents into dozens or more than 100 languages do not necessarily relieve the recipient of the obligation to translate vital documents into at least several of the more frequently encountered languages. The recipient should then set benchmarks for continued translations into the remaining languages over time.

Safe Harbor. Many recipients would like to ensure with greater certainty that they comply with their obligations to provide written translations in languages other than English. Paragraphs (a) and (b) below outline the circumstances that can provide a "safe harbor" for recipients regarding the requirements for translation of written materials. A "safe harbor" means that if a recipient provides written translations under these circumstances, such action will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient's written-translation obligations under Title VI.

The failure to provide written translations under the circumstances outlined in paragraphs (a) and (b) does not mean there is noncompliance. Rather these paragraphs merely provide a guide for recipients that would like greater certainty of compliance than can be provided by a fact-intensive, four-factor analysis. For example, even if a safe harbor is not used, if written translation of a certain document(s) would be so burdensome as to defeat the legitimate objectives of its program, it is not necessary. Other ways of providing meaningful access, such as effective oral interpretation of certain vital documents, might be acceptable under such circumstances.

Safe Harbor. The following actions will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient's written-translation obligations:

(a) The DOT recipient provides written translations of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5% or 1,000, whichever is less, of the population of persons eligible to be served or likely to be affected or encountered. Translation of other documents, if needed, can be provided orally; or

(b) If there are fewer than 50 persons in a language group that reaches the 5% trigger in (a), the recipient does not translate vital written materials but provides written notice in the primary language of the LEP language group of the right to receive competent oral interpretation of those written materials, free of cost.

These safe harbor provisions apply to the translation of written documents only. They do not affect the requirement to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals through competent oral interpreters where oral language services are needed and are reasonable.

Competence of Translators. As with oral interpreters, translators of written documents should be competent. Many of the same considerations apply. However, the skill of translating is very different from the skill of interpreting, and a person who is a competent interpreter may or may not be competent to translate, and vice versa.
Particularly where vital documents are being translated, competence can often be achieved by use of certified translators. Certification or accreditation may not always be possible or necessary. Alternatively, one translator can translate the document, and a second, independent translator could translate it back into English to check that the appropriate meaning has been conveyed. This is called "back translation."

Translators should understand the expected reading level of the audience and, where appropriate, have fundamental knowledge about the target language group's vocabulary and phraseology. Sometimes direct translation of materials results in a translation that is written at a much more difficult level than the English-language version or has no relevant equivalent meaning. Community organizations may be able to help consider whether a document is written at an appropriate level for the audience. Likewise, consistency in the words and phrases used to translate terms of art, legal, or other technical or programmatic terms helps avoid confusion by LEP individuals and may reduce costs. Creating or using already created glossaries of commonly used terms may be useful for LEP persons and translators and cost effective for the recipient. Providing translators with examples of previous accurate translations of similar material by other recipients or Federal agencies may also be helpful. While quality and accuracy of translation services are critical, they are nonetheless part of the appropriate mix of LEP services required. For instance, documents that are simple and have no important consequences for LEP persons who rely on them may be translated by translators who are less skilled than important documents with legal or other information upon which reliance has important consequences (including, e.g., driver's license written exams and documents regarding important benefits or services, or health, safety, or legal information). The permanent nature of written translations, however, imposes additional responsibility on the recipient to ensure that the quality and accuracy permit meaningful access by LEP persons.

VII. Elements of an Effective Implementation Plan on Language Assistance for LEP Persons

After completing the four-factor analysis and deciding what language assistance services are appropriate, a recipient should develop an implementation plan to address the identified needs of the LEP populations it serves. Although recipients have considerable flexibility in developing such a plan, maintaining a periodically updated written plan on language assistance for LEP persons ("LEP plan") for use by recipient employees serving the public would be an appropriate and cost-effective means of documenting compliance and providing a framework for the provision of timely and reasonable language assistance. Such written plans may also provide additional benefits to a recipient's managers in the areas of training, administration, planning, and budgeting. Thus, recipients may choose to document the language assistance services in their plan, and how staff and LEP persons can access those services. Certain DOT recipients, such as those serving very few LEP persons or those with very limited resources, may choose not to develop a written LEP plan. However, the absence of a written LEP plan does not obviate the underlying obligation to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons to a recipient's program or activities. In that event, a recipient should consider alternative ways to reasonably articulate a plan for providing meaningful access. Early input from entities such as schools, religious organizations, community groups, and groups working with new immigrants can be helpful in forming this planning process. The following five steps may be helpful in designing an LEP plan and are typically part of effective implementation plans.

---

10 For those languages in which no formal accreditation exists, a particular level of membership in a professional translation association can provide some indicator of professional competence.

11 For instance, although there may be languages that do not have a direct translation of some legal, technical, or program-related terms, the translator should be able to provide an appropriate translation. The translator should likely also make the recipient aware of this. Recipients can then work with translators to develop a consistent and appropriate set of descriptions of those terms in that language that can be used again, when appropriate.
(1) Identifying LEP Individuals Who Need Language Assistance

There should be an assessment of the number or proportion of LEP individuals eligible to be served or encountered and the frequency of encounters pursuant to the first two factors in the four-factor analysis.

One way to determine the language of communication is to use language identification cards (or “I speak cards”), which invite LEP persons to identify their language needs to staff. Such cards, for instance, might say, “I speak Spanish” in both Spanish and English, or “I speak Vietnamese” in both English and Vietnamese. To reduce costs of compliance, the Federal Government has made a set of these cards available on the Internet. The Census Bureau’s “I speak card” can be found and downloaded at http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm.

When records are normally kept of past interactions with members of the public, the language of the LEP person can be included as part of the record. In addition to helping employees identify the language of LEP persons they encounter, this process will help in future applications of the first two factors of the four-factor analysis. In addition, posting notices in commonly encountered languages notifying LEP persons of language assistance will encourage them to self-identify.

(2) Language Assistance Measures

An effective LEP plan would likely include information about the ways in which language assistance will be provided. For instance, recipients may want to include information on at least the following:

- Types of language services available.
- How recipient staff can obtain those services.
- How to respond to LEP callers.
- How to respond to written communications from LEP persons.
- How to respond to LEP individuals who have in-person contact with recipient staff.
- How to ensure competency of interpreters and translation services.
- How to respond to LEP individuals who have in-person contact with recipient staff.
- How to ensure competency of interpreters and translation services.

(3) Training Staff

Staff members should know their obligations to provide meaningful access to information and services for LEP persons, and all employees in public contact positions should be properly trained. An effective LEP plan would likely include training to ensure that:

- Staff knows about LEP policies and procedures.
- Staff having contact with the public (or those in a recipient's custody) is trained to work effectively with in-person and telephone interpreters.

Recipients may want to include this training as part of the orientation for new employees. Recipients have flexibility in deciding the manner in which the training is provided, and the more frequent the contact with LEP persons, the greater the need will be for in-depth training. However, management staff, even if they do not interact regularly with LEP persons, should be fully aware of and understand the plan so they can reinforce its importance and ensure its implementation by staff.

(4) Providing Notice to LEP Persons

Once an agency has decided, based on the four factors, that it will provide language services, it is important that the recipient notify LEP persons of services available free of charge. Recipients should provide this notice in languages LEP persons would understand. Examples of notification that recipients should consider include:
• Posting signs in intake areas and other entry points. This is important so that LEP persons can learn how to access those language services at initial points of contact. This is particularly true in areas with high volumes of LEP persons seeking access to certain transportation safety information, or other services and activities run by DOT recipients.12

• Stating in outreach documents that language services are available from the agency. Announcements could be in, for instance, brochures, booklets, and in outreach and recruitment information. These statements should be translated into the most common languages and could be “tagged” onto the front of common documents.

• Working with community-based organizations and other stakeholders to inform LEP individuals of the recipients’ services, including the availability of language assistance services.

• Using an automated telephone voice mail attendant or menu system. The system could be in the most common languages encountered. It should provide information about available language assistance services and how to get them.

• Including notices in local newspapers in languages other than English.

• Providing notices on non-English-language radio and television stations about the available language assistance services and how to get them.

• Providing presentations and/or notices at schools and religious organizations.

(5) Monitoring and Updating the LEP Plan

Recipients should, where appropriate, have a process for determining, on an ongoing basis, whether new documents, programs, services, and activities need to be made accessible for LEP individuals, and they may want to provide notice of any changes in services to the LEP public and to employees. In addition, recipients should consider whether changes in demographics, types of services, or other needs require annual reevaluation of their LEP plan. Less frequent reevaluation may be more appropriate where demographics, services, and needs are more static. One good way to evaluate the LEP plan is to seek feedback from the community.

In their reviews, recipients may want to consider assessing changes in:

• Current LEP populations in the service area or population affected or encountered.
• Frequency of encounters with LEP language groups.
• Nature and importance of activities to LEP persons.
• Availability of resources, including technological advances and sources of additional resources, and the costs imposed.
• Whether existing assistance is meeting the needs of LEP persons.
• Whether staff knows and understands the LEP plan and how to implement it.
• Whether identified sources for assistance are still available and viable.

In addition to these five elements, effective plans set clear goals, management accountability, and opportunities for community input and planning throughout the process.

VIII. Voluntary Compliance Effort

The goal for Title VI and Title VI regulatory enforcement is to achieve voluntary compliance. DOT enforces Title VI as it applies to recipients’ responsibilities to LEP persons through the procedures provided for in DOT’s Title VI regulations (49 CFR part 21, portions of which are provided in Appendix A).

---

12 For instance, signs in intake offices could State that free language assistance is available. The signs should be translated into the most common languages encountered and should explain how to get the necessary language assistance. The Social Security Administration has made such signs available at http://www.ssa.gov/multilanguage/langlist1.htm. DOT recipients could, for example, modify these signs for use in programs, activities, and services.
The Title VI regulations provide that DOT will investigate whenever it receives a complaint, report, or other information that alleges or indicates possible noncompliance with Title VI or its regulations. If the investigation results in a finding of compliance, DOT will inform the recipient in writing of this determination, including the basis for the determination. DOT uses voluntary mediation to resolve most complaints. However, if a case is fully investigated and results in a finding of noncompliance, DOT must inform the recipient of the noncompliance through a Letter of Findings that sets out the areas of noncompliance and the steps that must be taken to correct the noncompliance. It must attempt to secure voluntary compliance through informal means. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, DOT must secure compliance through the termination of Federal assistance after the DOT recipient has been given an opportunity for an administrative hearing and/or by referring the matter to DOJ with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce the laws of the United States. In engaging in voluntary compliance efforts, DOT proposes reasonable timetables for achieving compliance and consults with and assists recipients in exploring cost-effective ways of coming into compliance. In determining a recipient's compliance with the Title VI regulations, DOT's primary concern is to ensure that the recipient's activities and for all potential language minority groups may reasonably require a series of implementing actions over a period of time. However, in developing any phased implementation schedule, DOT recipients should ensure that the provision of appropriate assistance for significant LEP populations or with respect to activities having a significant impact on the health, safety, legal rights, or livelihood of beneficiaries is addressed first. Recipients are encouraged to document their efforts to provide LEP persons with meaningful access to federally assisted programs and activities.

IX. Promising Practices

The following examples are provided as illustrations of the responses of some recipients to the need to provide services to LEP persons, and are meant to be interesting and useful examples of ways in which LEP recipients can provide language services. Recipients are responsible for ensuring meaningful access to all portions of their program or activity, not just the portions to which DOT assistance is targeted. So long as the language services are accurate, timely, and appropriate in the manner outlined in this guidance, the types of promising practices summarized below can assist recipients in moving toward meeting the meaningful access requirements of Title VI and the Title VI regulations. These examples do not, however, constitute an endorsement by DOT, which will evaluate recipients' situations on a case-by-case basis using the factors described elsewhere in this guidance.

Language Banks. In several parts of the country, both urban and rural, community organizations and providers have created language banks that dispatch competent interpreters, at reasonable rates, to participating organizations, reducing the need to have on-staff interpreters for low-demand languages. This approach is particularly appropriate where there is a scarcity of language services or where there is a large variety of language needs but limited demand for any particular language. Language Support Offices. A State social services agency has established an "Office for LanguageInterpreter Services and Translation." This office tests and certifies all in-house and contract interpreters, provides agency-wide support for translation of forms, client mailings, publications, and other written materials into non-English languages, and monitors the policies of the agency and its vendors that affect LEP persons.
Some recipients have established working liaisons with local community colleges to educate the LEP community in transportation matters. One city formed a multilingual/multi-agency task force to address language barriers and the concerns of the affected communities. The task force completed a survey of city staff with multilingual skills in order to identify employees willing to serve as interpreters and is preparing lists of community and cultural organizations.

Use of Technology. Some recipients use their Internet and/or intranet capabilities to store translated documents online, which can be retrieved as needed and easily shared with other offices. For example, a multi-language gateway on a Web page could be developed for LEP persons and the public to access documents translated into other languages.

Telephone Information Lines and Hotlines. Recipients have subscribed to telephone-based interpretation services and established telephone information lines in common languages to instruct callers on how to leave a recorded message that will be answered by someone who speaks the caller’s language. For example, a recipient may choose to adopt a program similar to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA’s) Auto Safety Hotline, which has four representatives who speak Spanish and are available during normal hotline business hours (Mon.-Fri., 8 a.m.-10 p.m. eastern time).13

Signage and Other Outreach. Recipients have provided information about services, benefits, eligibility requirements, and the availability of free language assistance, in appropriate languages by (a) posting signs and placards with this information in public places such as grocery stores, bus shelters, and subway stations; (b) putting notices in print media and on radio and television stations that serve LEP groups or broadcasting in languages other than English;14 (c) airing videos and public service announcements for non-English-speaking residents; (d) placing flyers and signs in the offices of community-based organizations that serve large populations of LEP persons; (e) distributing information at places of worship, ethnic shopping areas, and other gathering places for LEP groups; (f) using posters with appropriate languages designed to reach potential beneficiaries; and (g) developing pictures, images, figures, or icons that could be understandable alternatives to written words.

DOT agencies and recipients have implemented numerous language access services:

DOT’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (formerly known as the Research and Special Programs Administration), at 49 CFR Sec. Sec. 192.616 and 195.440, requires pipeline officers to establish a program for effective reporting by the public of gas pipeline emergencies to the operator or public officials, also providing that the program must be conducted in English and other common languages.15 We recommend that recipients consider the appropriateness of such an approach to meet their individual service provision needs.

DOT’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has translated the National Standardized Child Passenger Safety Training Program curriculum into Spanish. The course, designed to help communities work with parents and caregivers on the proper installation of child safety seats, has been pilot tested and is scheduled to be available to the public by early 2006 through many national Latino organizations and State Highway Safety Offices.

13 The evening hours permit people from the West Coast (where a significant number of LEP persons reside) to call after work, providing an option for instructions in Spanish, a separate queue, and Spanish-speaking operators.
14 Notifications should be delivered in advance of scheduled meetings or events to allow time for persons to request accommodation and participate.
15 “Each [pipeline] operator shall establish a continuing educational program to enable customers, the public, appropriate government organizations, and persons engaged in excavation related activities to recognize a gas pipeline emergency for the purpose of reporting it to the operator or the appropriate public officials. The program and the media used should be as comprehensive as necessary to reach all areas in which the operator transports gas. The program must be conducted in English and in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of the non-English speaking population in the operator’s area.” 49 CFR Sec. 192.616. Section 195.440 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, imposes similar requirements in the case of hazardous liquid or carbon dioxide pipeline emergencies.
DOT’s Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) division offices in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Puerto Rico employ personnel conversant in Spanish to communicate the agency’s critical safety regulations.

The Del Rio, Texas, Police Department implemented the El Protector program in Del Rio and developed public service broadcasts in Spanish about traffic safety issues such as loading and unloading school buses, drinking and driving, and pedestrian safety. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) staff in Los Angeles reported that their system is equipped to receive calls in more than 150 languages, although Spanish is the most frequent language used by 911 callers who do not speak English.

District of Columbia DMV information, forms, and support material are available in German, Spanish, French, Russian, Dutch, and Portuguese and can be downloaded from the division's Web site. The DC DMV also provides a "City Services Guide" in Chinese, Korean, Spanish, and Vietnamese. DC's "Click It or Ticket" program material and information on child safety seat loaner programs and fitting station locations are available in Spanish.

The New Jersey Department of Motor Vehicles administers driver's license tests in more than 15 languages, including Arabic, French, Greek, Korean, Portuguese, and Turkish.16

In North Dakota, while the Traffic Safety Office acknowledges a limited minority population requiring assistance with translation, the Driver Licensing Unit offers the option of an oral test in Spanish.

The Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT) provides a Spanish version of the Commercial

Driver's License knowledge test using a touch screen computer, and study guides of the Iowa Driver's Manual in Albanian, Bosnian, Russian, Vietnamese, and Korean. IDOT established a liaison with a local community college to provide education for Bosnian refugees concerning the Commercial Motor Vehicle driving course.17

The Wisconsin DOT created a 3rd grade level study guide, the Motorist Study Manual Easy Reader, which was translated by the Janesville Literacy Council into Spanish. Wisconsin DOT also provides the regular 6th grade level version of the Reader in English, Spanish, and Hmong; a Motorcycle Study Manual in English and Spanish; and a CDL (Commercial Driver's License) Study Manual in English and Spanish. In addition, Knowledge and Highway Sign Tests are written in 13 languages other than English, recorded on audiocassette tapes in English and Spanish, or orally interpreted by bilingual staffers obtained from a roster of Wisconsin DOT employees who speak, read, or write foreign languages.

The Idaho Office of Traffic and Highway Safety implemented a Spanish-language safety belt media campaign to educate its Hispanic community on the statewide “Click It, Don't Risk It!” program to boost seat belt use. Information appears in Unido, Idaho’s largest Spanish-language newspaper, and warns all motorists to buckle up or risk receiving a safety belt citation.

The New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department, with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) support, provides Spanish-language translations of its Right-of-Way Acquisition and Relocation brochures and also employs bilingual right-of-way agents to discuss project impacts in Spanish. The State of Oregon developed a report on multilingual services provided by State agencies. State agencies will use the final document to enhance their existing programs, including expanding communication efforts to serve and protect all Oregonians.

16 DOT recommends that State agencies share such information, to avoid the necessity of each agency performing every translation.
17 DOT especially recommends the idea of working with local community colleges to educate the LEP community in transportation matters.
The Texas DOT utilizes bilingual employees in its permit office to provide instruction and assistance to LEP Spanish-speaking truck drivers when providing permits to route overweight trucks through Texas. In its "On the Job Training Supportive Services Program" Texas DOT has used Spanish-language television to inform people who have difficulty reading English of opportunities in the construction industry.

When the Virginia DOT (VDOT) became aware that several Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms were about to be removed from construction projects in Northern Virginia because they required certified concrete inspectors, and that they could not comply because the concrete inspection test was only offered in English, it used supportive services funding from the Federal Highway Administration to translate the training manual and test material into Spanish. VDOT also provides tutoring for the DBE firms.

The Virginia State Police maintains a written list of interpreters available statewide to troopers through the Red Cross Language Bank, as well as universities and local police departments.

The Colorado State Patrol produced safety brochures in Spanish for farmers and ranchers. It has also printed brochures in Spanish pertaining to regulatory requirements for trucking firms.

In preparation of its 20-year planning document, the Transportation Concept Report, the California DOT (Caltrans) held a public meeting titled "Planning the Future of Highway 1" in the largely Hispanic city of Guadalupe, through which Highway 1 runs. The meeting was broadcast on the local public access channel since many of the Spanish-speaking residents potentially affected by Highway 1 projects rely on the channel to receive public affairs information. Caltrans provided a Spanish-language interpreter during the meeting and also made its Spanish-speaking public affairs officer available to meet with participants individually.

During project planning for interstate improvements along Interstate 710 in California, engineers presented "good" alternatives to the affected communities; however, the proposed highway expansion would have removed low-income homes in communities that are 98% Spanish speaking. To ensure that their concerns were heard, California identified the affected communities and facilitated the establishment of Community Advisory Committees that held bilingual workshops between engineers and the public.

The Minnesota DOT authored a manual detailing its requirements to provide access to all residents of Minnesota under environmental justice standards, which included ideas such as publishing notices in non-English newspapers, printing notices in appropriate languages, and providing interpreters at public meetings.

In New Mexico, the Zuni Entrepreneurial Enterprises, Inc. (ZEE) Public Transportation Program designed the Zuni JOBLINKS program to develop, implement, and maintain a transportation system to link Native Americans and other traditionally unserved/underserved persons in the service area to needed vocational training and employment opportunities. Outreach for the program included radio announcements and posting of signs in English and Zuni that described ZEE's services and provided ZEE's phone number.

Washington, DC's Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) publishes pocket guides regarding its system in French, Spanish, German, and Japanese, and has a multilanguage website link.

In North Dakota, Souris Basin Transportation (SBT) started using visual logos on the sides of the vehicles to help illiterate passengers identify the bus on which they were riding. Although the illiteracy rate has dropped among seniors, SBT kept the logos on its vehicles for use by the growing LEP population and also added volunteers who speak languages other than English (such as Spanish, German, Norwegian, Swedish, and French) available by phone to drivers and staff.

New York City Transit MetroCard vending machines are located in every station and contain software that allows them to be programmed in three languages in addition to English, based upon area demographics. Currently, these machines are capable of providing information in Spanish, French, French Creole, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Italian, Korean, Greek, and Polish.
The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) advertises upcoming service and fare changes in Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, and Chinese language newspapers. MARTA also produces a bilingual (Spanish/English) service modifications booklet.

The Fort-Worth Transportation Authority communicates information about service and fare changes in Spanish and English. It recruits Spanish-speaking customer service representatives and bus operators and has a community outreach liaison who is bilingual. The transit provider also provides a Spanish-language interpreter at all public meetings.

The Salt Lake City International Airport maintains a list of 35 bilingual and multilingual employees who speak one of 19 languages (including three dialects of Chinese) and their contact information. The list is published in the Airport Information Handbook and provided to all airport employees. The airport also contracts with a telephonic interpretation service to provide on-demand telephone interpretation services to beneficiaries.

The Port of Seattle has 16 "Pathfinders" on staff who act as guides and information sources throughout the Seattle Tacoma International Airport. A key selection criterion for Pathfinders is multilingual ability. The Pathfinders collectively speak 15 languages and are often called on to act as interpreters for travelers who do not speak English. Pathfinders greet all international flights and are assigned to do so based on language skills.

Seattle Tacoma International Airport's trains carry announcements in English, Japanese, and Korean. The Port of Seattle contributed $5,000 to the creation of the City of Tukwila's "Newcomers Guide," which is published in six languages and includes information about the airport and Airport Jobs, a referral service for employment at the airport.

The following is a sample notice that would be useful for recipients to add to the publications or signs for their programs, services, or activities, in order to notify LEP individuals of the availability of materials and services in other languages.

Sample Notice of Availability of Materials and Services

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For hearing-impaired individuals or non-English-speaking attendees wishing to arrange for a sign language or foreign language interpreter, please call or fax [name] of [organization] at Phone: xxx-yyy-zzzz, TTY: xxx-yyy-zzzz, or Fax: xxx-yyy-zzzz. 18

18 If there is a known and substantial LEP population that may be served by the program discussed in the notice, the notice should be in the appropriate non-English language.
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DOT’s Title VI regulation (49 CFR part 21) states the following, in relevant part:

Sec. 21.5 Discrimination prohibited.

(a) General. No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under, any program to which this part applies.

(b) Specific discriminatory actions prohibited:

(1) A recipient under any program to which this part applies may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin:

(i) Deny a person any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;

(ii) Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit to a person which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;

(iii) Subject a person to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(iv) Restrict a person in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(vi) Deny a person an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program; or

(vii) Deny a person the opportunity to participate as a member of a planning, advisory, or similar body which is an integral part of the program.

(2) A recipient, in determining the types of services, financial aid, or other benefits, or facilities which will be provided under any such program, or the class of person to whom, or the situations in which, such services, financial aid, other benefits, or facilities will be provided under any such program, or the class of persons to be afforded an opportunity to participate in any such program; may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting persons to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program with respect to individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

* * *

(5) The enumeration of specific forms of prohibited discrimination in this paragraph does not limit the generality of the prohibition in paragraph (a) of this section.

* * *

(7) This part does not prohibit the consideration of race, color, or national origin if the purpose and effect are to remove or overcome the consequences of practices or impediments which have restricted the availability of, or participation in, the program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.
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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under DOJ regulations implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq. (Title VI), recipients of Federal financial assistance have a responsibility to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency (LEP). See 28 CFR 42.104(b)(2). Executive Order 13166, reprinted at 65 FR 50121 (August 16, 2000), directs each Federal agency that extends assistance subject to the requirements of Title VI to publish guidance for its respective recipients clarifying that obligation. Executive Order 13166 further directs that all such guidance documents be consistent with the compliance standards and framework detailed in DOJ Policy Guidance entitled “Enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—National Origin Discrimination Against Persons with Limited English Proficiency.” See 65 FR 50123 (August 16, 2000).

Initial guidance on DOJ recipients’ obligations to take reasonable steps to ensure access by LEP persons was published on January 16, 2001. See 66 FR 3834. That guidance document was republished for additional public comment on January 18, 2002. See 67 FR 2671. Based on public comments filed in response to the January 18, 2002 republication, DOJ published revised draft guidance for public comment on April 18, 2002. See 67 FR 19237.
DOJ received 24 comments in response to its April 18, 2002 publication of revised draft guidance on DOJ recipients’ obligations to take reasonable steps to ensure access to programs and activities by LEP persons. The comments reflected the views of individuals, organizations serving LEP populations, organizations favoring the use of the English language, language assistance service providers, and State agencies. While many comments identified areas for improvement and/or revision, the overall response to the draft DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance was favorable. Taken together, a majority of the comments described the draft guidance as incorporating “reasonable standards” or “helpful provisions” providing “useful suggestions instead of mandatory requirements” reflecting “common sense” and a “more measured tone” over prior LEP guidance documents.

Two of the comments urged withdrawal of the draft guidance as unsupported by law. In response, the Department notes here as it did in the draft Recipient LEP Guidance published on April 18, 2002 that the Department’s commitment to implement Title VI through regulations reaching language barriers is long-standing and is unaffected by recent judicial action precluding individuals from bringing judicial actions seeking to enforce those agency regulations. See 67 FR at 19238–19239

This particular policy guidance clarifies existing statutory and regulatory requirements for LEP persons by providing a description of the factors recipients should consider in fulfilling their responsibilities to LEP persons.

Of the remaining 22 comments, three supported adoption of the draft guidance as published, and 19, while supportive of the guidance and the Department’s leadership in this area, suggested modifications which would, in their view, either (1) clarify the application of the flexible compliance standard incorporated by the draft guidance to particular areas or situations, or (2) provide a more definitive statement of the minimal compliance standards in this area. Several areas were raised in more than one comment. In the order most often raised, those common areas of comment were (1) recipient language assistance plans, (2) use of informal interpreters, written translation safe harbors, and cost considerations. The comments in each of these areas are summarized and discussed below.

Recipient Language Assistance Plans. A large number of comments recommended that written language assistance plans (LEP Plans) be required of all recipients. The Department is cognizant of the value of written LEP plans in documenting a recipient’s compliance with its obligation to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons, and in providing a framework for the provision of reasonable and necessary language assistance to LEP persons. The Department is also aware of the related training, operational, and planning benefits most recipients would derive from the generation and maintenance of an updated written language assistance plan for use by its employees. In the large majority of cases, the benefits flowing from a written language assistance plan has caused or will likely cause recipients to develop, with varying degrees of detail, such written plans. Even small recipients with limited contact with LEP persons would likely benefit from having a plan in place to assure that, when the need arises, staff have a written plan to turn to—even if it is only how to access a telephonic or community-based interpretation service—when determining what language services to provide and how to provide them.

However, the fact that the vast majority of the Department’s recipients already have or will likely develop a written LEP plan to reap its many benefits does not necessarily mean that every recipient, however small its staff, limited its resources, or focused its services, will realize the same benefits and thus must follow an identical path. Without clear evidence suggesting that the absence of written plans for every single recipient is impeding accomplishment of the goal of meaningful access, the Department elects at this juncture to strongly recommend but not require written language assistance plans. The

[Page 41456]

Department stresses in this regard that neither the absence of a requirement of written LEP plans in all cases nor the election by an individual recipient against drafting a plan obviates the underlying obligation on the part of each recipient to provide, consistent with Title VI, the Title VI regulations, and the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance, reasonable, timely, and appropriate language assistance to the LEP populations each serves.
While the Department continues to believe that the Recipient LEP Guidance strikes the correct balance between recommendations and requirements in this area, the Department has revised the introductory paragraph of Section VII of the Recipient LEP Guidance to acknowledge a recipient’s discretion in drafting a written LEP plan yet to emphasize the many benefits that weigh in favor of such a written plan in the vast majority of cases.

Informal Interpreters. As in the case of written LEP plans, a large number of the comments urged the incorporation of more definitive language strongly discouraging or severely limiting the use of informal interpreters such as family members, guardians, caretakers, friends, or fellow inmates or detainees. Some recommended that the draft guidance be revised to prohibit the use of informal interpreters except in limited or emergency situations. A common sub-theme running through many of these comments was a concern regarding the technical and ethical competency of such interpreters to ensure meaningful and appropriate access at the level and of the type contemplated under the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance.1

As in the case of written LEP plans, the Department believes that the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance provides sufficient guidance to allow recipients to strike the proper balance between the many situations where the use of informal interpreters is inappropriate, and the few situations where the transitory and/or limited use of informal interpreters is necessary and appropriate in light of the nature of a service or benefit being provided and the factual context in which that service or benefit is being provided. Nonetheless, the Department concludes that the potential for the inappropriate use of informal interpreters or, conversely, its unnecessary avoidance, can be minimized through additional clarifications in the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance. Towards that end, the subsection titled “Use of Family Members, Friends, Other Inmates, or Other Detainees as Interpreters” of Section VI.A. of the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance has been revised to include guardians and caretakers among the potential class of informal interpreters, to note that beneficiaries who elect to provide their own informal interpreter do so at their own expense, to clarify that reliance on informal interpreters should not be part of any recipient LEP plan, and to expand the discussion of the special considerations that should guide a recipient’s limited reliance on informal interpreters.

Safe Harbors. Several comments focused on safe harbor and vital documents provisions of the written translations section of the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance.2 A few comments observed that the safe harbor standard set out in the Recipient LEP Guidance was too high, potentially permitting recipients to avoid translating several critical types of vital documents (e.g., notices of denials of benefits or rights, leases, rules of conduct, etc.). In contrast, another comment pointed to this same standard as support for the position that the safe harbor provision was too low, potentially requiring a large recipient to incur extraordinary fiscal burdens to translate all documents associated with the program or activity.

---

1 A few comments urged the Department to incorporate language detailing particular interpretation standards or approaches. The Department declines to set, as part of the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance, professional or technical standards for interpretation applicable to all recipients in every community and in all situations. General guidelines for translator and interpreter competency are already set forth in the guidance. Technical and professional standards and necessary vocabulary and skills for court interpreters and interpreters in custodial interrogations, for instance, would be different from those for emergency service interpreters, or, in turn, those for interpreters in educational programs for correctional facilities. Thus, recipients, beneficiaries, and associations of professional interpreters and translators should collaborate in identifying the applicable professional and technical interpretation standards that are appropriate for particular situations.

2 One comment pointed out that current demographic information based on the 2000 Census or other data was not readily available to assist recipients in identifying the number or proportion of LEP persons and the significant language groups among their otherwise eligible beneficiaries. The Department is aware of this potential difficulty and is, among other things, working with the Census Bureau, among other entities, to increase the availability of such demographic data.
The decision as to what program-related documents should be translated into languages other than English is a difficult one. While documents generated by a recipient may be helpful in understanding a program or activity, not all are critical or vital to ensuring meaningful access by beneficiaries generally and LEP persons specifically. Some documents may create or define legally enforceable rights or responsibilities on the part of individual beneficiaries (e.g., leases, rules of conduct, notices of benefit denials, etc.). Others, such as application or certification forms, solicit important information required to establish or maintain eligibility to participate in a federally-assisted program or activity. And for some programs or activities, written documents may be the core benefit or service provided by the program or activity. Moreover, some programs or activities may be specifically focused on providing benefits or services to significant LEP populations. Finally, a recipient may elect to solicit vital information orally as a substitute for written documents. For example, many State unemployment insurance programs are transitioning away from paper-based application and certification forms in favor of telephone-based systems. Also, certain languages (e.g., Hmong) are oral rather than written, and thus a high percentage of such LEP speakers will likely be unable to read translated documents or written instructions since it is only recently that such languages have been converted to a written form. Each of these factors should play a role in deciding what documents should be translated, what target languages other than English are appropriate, or even whether more effective alternatives to a continued reliance on written documents to obtain or process vital information exist.

As has been emphasized elsewhere, the Recipient LEP Guidance is not intended to provide a definitive answer governing the translation of written documents for all recipients applicable in all cases. Rather, in drafting the safe harbor and vital documents provisions of the Recipient LEP Guidance, the Department sought to provide one, but not necessarily the only, point of reference for when a recipient should consider translations of documents (or the implementation of alternatives to such documents) in light of its particular program or activity, the document or information in question, and the potential LEP populations served. In furtherance of this purpose, the safe harbor and vital document provisions of the Recipient LEP Guidance have been revised to clarify the elements of the flexible translation standard, and to acknowledge that distinctions can and should be made between frequently-encountered and less commonly-encountered languages when identifying languages for translation.

Costs Considerations. A number of comments focused on cost considerations as an element of the Department’s flexible four-factor analysis for identifying and addressing the language assistance needs of LEP persons. While none urged that costs be excluded, some comments expressed concern that a recipient could use cost as a basis for avoiding otherwise reasonable and necessary language assistance to LEP persons. In contrast, a few comments suggested that the flexible fact-dependent compliance standard incorporated by the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance, when combined with the desire of most recipients to avoid the risk of noncompliance, could lead some large, state-wide recipients to incur unnecessary or inappropriate fiscal burdens in the face of already strained program budgets. The Department is mindful that cost considerations could be inappropriately used to avoid providing otherwise reasonable and necessary language assistance. Similarly, cost considerations could be inappropriately ignored or minimized to justify the provision of a particular level or type of language service where less costly equally effective alternatives exist. The Department also does not dismiss the possibility that the identified need for language services might be quite costly for certain types of recipients in certain communities, particularly if they have not been keeping up with the changing needs of the populations they serve over time.

The potential for possible abuse of cost considerations by some does not, in the Department’s view, justify its elimination as a factor in all cases when determining the appropriate “mix” of reasonable language assistance services determined necessary under the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons to federally assisted programs and activities. The Department continues to believe that costs are a legitimate consideration in identifying the reasonableness of particular language assistance measures, and that the DOJ Recipient LEP Guidance identifies the appropriate framework through which costs are to be considered.
In addition to the four larger concerns noted above, the Department has substituted, where appropriate, technical or stylistic changes that more clearly articulate, in the Department’s view, the underlying principle, guideline, or recommendation detailed in the Guidance. In addition, the Guidance has been modified to expand the definition of “courts” to include administrative adjudications conducted by a recipient; to acknowledge that English language instruction is an important adjunct to (but not substitute for) the obligation to ensure access to federally assisted programs and activities by all eligible persons; and to clarify the Guidance’s application to activities undertaken by a recipient either voluntarily or under contract in support of a Federal agency’s functions.

After appropriate revision based on a careful consideration of the comments, with particular focus on the common concerns summarized above, the Department adopts final “Guidance to Federal Financial Assistance Recipients Regarding Title VI Prohibition Against National Origin Discrimination Affecting Limited English Proficient Persons.” The text of this final guidance document appears below.

It has been determined that this Guidance, which supplants existing Guidance on the same subject previously published at 66 FR 3834 (January 16, 2001), does not constitute a regulation subject to the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553.

Dated: June 12, 2002.
R. Alexander Acosta,
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

I. Introduction

Most individuals living in the United States read, write, speak and understand English. There are many individuals, however, for whom English is not their primary language. For instance, based on the 2000 census, over 26 million individuals speak Spanish and almost 7 million individuals speak an Asian or Pacific Island language at home. If these individuals have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English, they are limited English proficient, or “LEP.” While detailed data from the 2000 census has not yet been released, 26% of all Spanish-speakers, 29.9% of all Chinese-speakers, and 28.2% of all Vietnamese-speakers reported that they spoke English “not well” or “not at all” in response to the 1990 census.

Language for LEP individuals can be a barrier to accessing important benefits or services, understanding and exercising important rights, complying with applicable responsibilities, or understanding other information provided by federally funded programs and activities. The Federal Government funds an array of services that can be made accessible to otherwise eligible LEP persons. The Federal Government is committed to improving the accessibility of these programs and activities to eligible LEP persons, a goal that reinforces its equally important commitment to promoting programs and activities designed to help individuals learn English.

Recipients should not overlook the long-term positive impacts of incorporating or offering English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in parallel with language assistance services. ESL courses can serve as an important adjunct to a proper LEP plan. However, the fact that ESL classes are made available does not obviate the statutory and regulatory requirement to provide meaningful access for those who are not yet English proficient. Recipients of Federal financial assistance have an obligation to reduce language barriers that can preclude meaningful access by LEP persons to important government services.¹

¹ DOJ recognizes that many recipients had language assistance programs in place prior to the issuance of Executive Order 13166. This policy guidance provides a uniform framework for a recipient to integrate, formalize, and assess the continued vitality of these existing and possibly additional reasonable efforts based on the nature of its program or activity, the current needs of the LEP populations it encounters, and its prior experience in providing language services in the community it serves.

² The policy guidance is not a regulation but rather a guide. Title VI and its implementing regulations require that recipients take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons. This guidance provides an analytical framework that recipients may use to determine how best to comply with statutory and regulatory obligations to provide meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are limited English proficient.
In certain circumstances, failure to ensure that LEP persons can effectively participate in or benefit from federally assisted programs and activities may violate the prohibition under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d and Title VI regulations against national origin discrimination. The purpose of this policy guidance is to assist recipients in fulfilling their responsibilities to provide meaningful access to LEP persons under existing law. This policy guidance clarifies existing legal requirements for LEP persons by providing a description of the factors recipients should consider in fulfilling their responsibilities to LEP persons. These are the same criteria DOJ will use in evaluating whether recipients are in compliance with Title VI and Title VI regulations.

The Department of Justice’s role under Executive Order 13166 is unique. The Order charges DOJ with responsibility for providing LEP Guidance to other Federal agencies and for ensuring consistency among each agency-specific guidance. Consistency among Departments of the Federal government is particularly important. Inconsistency or contradictory guidance could confuse recipients of Federal funds and needlessly increase costs without rendering the meaningful access for LEP persons that this

Guidance is designed to address. As with most government initiatives, this requires balancing several principles. While this Guidance discusses that balance in some detail, it is important to note the basic principles behind that balance. First, we must ensure that federally assisted programs aimed at the American public do not leave some behind simply because they face challenges communicating in English. This is of particular importance because, in many cases, LEP individuals form a substantial portion of those encountered in federally assisted programs. Second, we must achieve this goal while finding constructive methods to reduce the costs of LEP requirements on small businesses, small local governments, or small non-profits that receive Federal financial assistance.

There are many productive steps that the Federal Government, either collectively or as individual grant agencies, can take to help recipients reduce the costs of language services without sacrificing meaningful access for LEP persons. Without these steps, certain smaller grantees may well choose not to participate in federally assisted programs, threatening the critical functions that the programs strive to provide. To that end, the Department plans to continue to provide assistance and guidance in this important area. In addition, DOJ plans to work with representatives of law enforcement, corrections, courts, administrative agencies, and LEP persons to identify and share model plans, examples of best practices, and cost-saving approaches. Moreover, DOJ intends to explore how language assistance measures, resources and cost-containment approaches developed with respect to its own federally conducted programs and activities can be effectively shared or otherwise made available to recipients, particularly small businesses, small local governments, and small non-profits. An interagency working group on LEP has developed a Web site, www.lep.gov, to assist in disseminating this information to recipients, Federal agencies, and the communities being served.

Many commentators have noted that some have interpreted the case of Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001), as impliedly striking down the regulations promulgated under Title VI that form the basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities. We have taken the position that this is not the case, and will continue to do so. Accordingly, we will strive to ensure that federally assisted programs and activities work in a way that is effective for all eligible beneficiaries, including those with limited English proficiency.

II. Legal Authority

Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, provides that no person shall “on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Section 602 authorizes and directs Federal agencies that are empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity “to effectuate the provisions of [section 601] * * * by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability.” 42 U.S.C. 2000d–1.
Department of Justice regulations promulgated pursuant to section 602 forbid recipients from "utilizing criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin."

28 CFR 42.104(b)(2).

The Supreme Court, in Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), interpreted regulations promulgated by the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including a regulation similar to that of DOJ, 45 CFR 80.3(b)(2), to hold that Title VI prohibits conduct that has a disproportionate effect on LEP persons because such conduct constitutes national-origin discrimination. In Lau, a San Francisco school district that had a significant number of non-English speaking students of Chinese origin was required to take reasonable steps to provide them with a meaningful opportunity to participate in federally funded educational programs.

On August 11, 2000, Executive Order 13166 was issued. "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency," 65 FR 50121 (August 16, 2000). Under that order, every Federal agency that provides financial assistance to non-Federal entities must publish guidance on how their recipients can provide meaningful access to LEP persons and thus comply with Title VI regulations forbidding funding recipients from "restricting an individual in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program" or from "utilizing criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin."


Subsequently, Federal agencies raised questions regarding the requirements of the Executive Order, especially in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001). On October 26, 2001, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr., Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, issued a memorandum for "Heads of Departments and Agencies, General Counsels and Civil Rights Directors." This memorandum clarified and reaffirmed the DOJ LEP Guidance in light of Sandoval. The Assistant Attorney General stated that because Sandoval did not invalidate any Title VI regulations that proscribe conduct that has a disparate impact on covered groups—the types of regulations that form the legal basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities—the Executive Order remains in force.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13166, DOJ developed its own guidance document for recipients and initially
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3 The memorandum noted that some commentators have interpreted Sandoval as impliedly striking down the disparate-impact regulations promulgated under Title VI that form the basis for the part of Executive Order 13166 that applies to federally assisted programs and activities. See, e.g., Sandoval, 532 U.S. at 286, 286 n.6 ("[W]e assume for purposes of this decision that section 602 confers the authority to promulgate disparate-impact regulations; * * * We cannot help observing, however, how strange it is to say that disparate-impact regulations are 'inspired by, at the service of, and inseparably intertwined with 'Sec. 601 * * * when Sec. 601 permits the very behavior that the regulations forbid.'"). The memorandum, however, made clear that DOJ disagreed with the commentators’ interpretation. Sandoval holds principally that there is no private right of action to enforce Title VI disparate-impact regulations. It did not address the validity of those regulations or Executive Order 13166 or otherwise limit the authority and responsibility of Federal grant agencies to enforce their own implementing regulations.

This guidance document is thus published pursuant to Executive Order 13166 and supplants the January 16, 2001 publication in light of the public comment received and Assistant Attorney General Boyd’s October 26, 2001 clarifying memorandum.

III. Who Is Covered?

Department of Justice regulations, 28 CFR 42.104(b)(2), require all recipients of Federal financial assistance from DOJ to provide meaningful access to LEP persons. Federal financial assistance includes grants, training, use of equipment, donations of surplus property, and other assistance. Recipients of DOJ assistance include, for example:

- Police and sheriffs’ departments
- Departments of corrections, jails, and detention facilities, including those recipients that house detainees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service
- Courts
- Certain non profit agencies with law enforcement, public safety, and victim assistance missions;
- Other entities with public safety and emergency service missions.
- Sub-recipients likewise are covered when Federal funds are passed through from one recipient to a sub-recipient.

Coverage extends to a recipient’s entire program or activity, i.e., to all parts of a recipient’s operations. This is true even if only one part of the recipient receives the Federal assistance.

Example: DOJ provides assistance to a State department of corrections to improve a particular prison facility. All of the operations of the entire State department of corrections—not just the particular prison—are covered.

Finally, some recipients operate in jurisdictions in which English has been declared the official language. Nonetheless, these recipients continue to be subject to Federal non-discrimination requirements, including those applicable to the provision of federally assisted services to persons with limited English proficiency.

IV. Who Is a Limited English Proficient Individual?

Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English can be limited English proficient, or “LEP,” entitled to language assistance with respect to a particular type of service, benefit, or encounter.

---

4 Pursuant to Executive Order 13166, the meaningful access requirement of the Title VI regulations and the four-factor analysis set forth in the DOJ LEP Guidance are to additionally apply to the programs and activities of Federal agencies, including the Department of Justice.

5 As used in this guidance, the word “court” or “courts” includes administrative adjudicatory systems or administrative hearings administered or conducted by a recipient.

6 However, if a Federal agency were to decide to terminate Federal funds based on noncompliance with Title VI or its regulations, only funds directed to the particular program or activity that is out of compliance would be terminated. 42 U.S.C. 2000d–1.
Examples of populations likely to include LEP persons who are encountered and/or served by DOJ recipients and should be considered when planning language services include, but are not limited to:

- Persons who are in the custody of the recipient, including juveniles, detainees, wards, and inmates.
- Persons subject to or serviced by law enforcement activities, including, for example, suspects, violators, witnesses, victims, those subject to immigration-related investigations by recipient law enforcement agencies, and community members seeking to participate in crime prevention or awareness activities.
- Persons who encounter the court system.
- Parents and family members of the above.

V. How Does a Recipient Determine the Extent of Its Obligation To Provide LEP Services?

Recipients are required to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons. While designed to be a flexible and fact-dependent standard, the starting point is an individualized assessment that balances the following four factors: (1) The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by the program or grantee; (2) the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program; (3) the nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the program to people’s lives; and (4) the resources available to the grantee/recipient and costs. As indicated above, the intent of this guidance is to suggest a balance that ensures meaningful access by LEP persons to critical services while not imposing undue burdens on small business, small local governments, or small nonprofits.

After applying the above four-factor analysis, a recipient may conclude that different language assistance measures are sufficient for the different types of programs or activities in which it engages. For instance, some of a recipient’s activities will be more important than others and/or have greater impact on or contact with LEP persons, and thus may require more in the way of language assistance. The flexibility that recipients have in addressing the needs of the LEP populations they serve does not diminish, and should not be used to minimize the obligation that those needs be addressed. DOJ recipients should apply the following four factors to the various kinds of contacts that they have with the public to assess language needs and decide what reasonable steps they should take to ensure meaningful access for LEP persons.

(1) The Number or Proportion of LEP Persons Served or Encountered in the Eligible Service Population

One factor in determining what language services recipients should provide is the number or proportion of LEP persons from a particular language group served or encountered in the eligible service population. The greater the number or proportion of these LEP persons, the more likely language services are needed. Ordinarily, persons “eligible to be served, or likely to be directly affected, by” a recipient’s program or activity are those who are served or encountered in the eligible service population. This population will be program-specific, and includes persons who are in the geographic area that has been approved by a Federal grant agency as the recipient’s service area. However, where, for instance, a precinct serves a large LEP population, the appropriate service area is most likely the precinct, and not the entire population served by the department. Where no service area has previously been approved, the relevant service area may be that which is approved by State or local authorities or designated by the recipient itself, provided that these designations do not themselves discriminatorily exclude certain populations. Appendix A provides examples to assist in determining the relevant service area. When considering the number or proportion of LEP individuals in a service area, recipients should consider LEP parent(s) when their English-proficient or LEP minor children and dependents encounter the legal system.
Recipients should first examine their prior experiences with LEP encounters and determine the breadth and scope of language services that were needed. In conducting this analysis, it is important to include language minority populations that are eligible for their programs or activities but may be underserved because of existing language barriers. Other data should be consulted to refine or validate a recipient’s prior experience, including the latest census data for the area served, data from school systems and from community organizations, and data from State and local governments. Community agencies, school systems, religious organizations, legal aid entities, and others can often assist in identifying populations for whom outreach is needed and who would benefit from the recipients’ programs and activities were language services provided.

(2) The Frequency With Which LEP Individuals Come in Contact With the Program

Recipients should assess, as accurately as possible, the frequency with which they have or should have contact with an LEP individual from different language groups seeking assistance. The more frequent the contact with a particular language group, the more likely that enhanced language services in that language are needed. The steps that are reasonable for a recipient that serves an LEP person on a one-time basis will be very different than those expected from a recipient that serves LEP persons daily. It is also advisable to consider the frequency of different types of language contacts. For example, frequent contacts with Spanish-speaking people who are LEP may require certain assistance in Spanish. Less frequent contact with different language groups may suggest a different and less intensified solution. If an LEP individual accesses a program or service on a daily basis, a recipient has greater duties than if the same individual’s program or activity contact is unpredictable or infrequent. But even recipients that serve LEP persons on an unpredictable or infrequent basis should use this balancing analysis to determine what to do if an LEP individual seeks services under the program in question. This plan need not be intricate. It may be as simple as being prepared to use one of the commercially-available telephonic interpretation services to obtain immediate interpreter services. In applying this standard, recipients should take care to consider whether appropriate outreach to LEP persons could increase the frequency of contact with LEP language groups.

(3) The Nature and Importance of the Program, Activity, or Service Provided by the Program

The more important the activity, information, service, or program, or the greater the possible consequences of the contact to the LEP individuals, the more likely language services are needed. The obligations to communicate rights to a person who is arrested or to provide medical services to an ill or injured inmate differ, for example, from those to provide bicycle safety courses or recreational programming. A recipient needs to determine whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for the LEP individual. Decisions by a Federal, State, or local entity to make an activity compulsory, such as particular educational programs in a correctional facility or the communication of Miranda rights, can serve as strong evidence of the program’s importance.

(4) The Resources Available to the Recipient and Costs

A recipient’s level of resources and the costs that would be imposed on it may have an impact on the nature of the steps it should take. Smaller recipients with more limited budgets are not expected to provide the same level of language services as larger recipients with larger budgets. In addition, “reasonable steps” may cease to be reasonable where the costs imposed substantially exceed the benefits.

---

7 The focus of the analysis is on lack of English proficiency, not the ability to speak more than one language. Note that demographic data may indicate the most frequently spoken languages other than English and the percentage of people who speak that language who speak or understand English less than well. Some of the most commonly spoken languages other than English may be spoken by people who are also overwhelmingly proficient in English. Thus, they may not be the languages spoken most frequently by limited English proficient individuals. When using demographic data, it is important to focus in on the languages spoken by those who are not proficient in English.

8 Small recipients with limited resources may find that entering into a bulk telephonic interpretation service contract will prove cost effective.
Resource and cost issues, however, can often be reduced by technological advances; the sharing of language assistance materials and services among and between recipients, advocacy groups, and Federal grant agencies; and reasonable business practices. Where appropriate, training bilingual staff to act as interpreters and translators, information sharing through industry groups, telephonic and video conferencing interpretation services, pooling resources and standardizing documents to reduce translation needs, using qualified translators and interpreters to ensure that documents need not be “fixed” later and that inaccurate interpretations do not cause delay or other costs, centralizing interpreter and translator services to achieve economies of scale, or the formalized use of qualified community volunteers, for example, may help reduce costs. Recipients should carefully explore the most cost-effective means of delivering competent and accurate language services before limiting services due to resource concerns. Large entities and those entities serving a significant number or proportion of LEP persons should ensure that their resource limitations are well-substantiated before using this factor as a reason to limit language assistance. Such recipients may find it useful to be able to articulate, through documentation or in some other reasonable manner, their process for determining that language services would be limited based on resources or costs.

This four-factor analysis necessarily implicates the “mix” of LEP services required. Recipients have two main ways to provide language services: Oral interpretation either in person or via telephone interpretation service (hereinafter “interpretation”) and written translation (hereinafter “translation”). Oral interpretation can range from on-site interpreters for critical services provided to a high volume of LEP persons to access through commercially-available telephonic interpretation services. Written translation, likewise, can range from translation of an entire document to translation of a short description of the document. In some cases, language services should be made available on an expedited basis while in others the LEP individual may be referred to another office of the recipient for language assistance.

The correct mix should be based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis. For instance, a police department in a largely Hispanic neighborhood may need immediate oral interpreters available and should give serious consideration to hiring some bilingual staff. (Of course, many police departments have already made such arrangements.) In contrast, there may be circumstances where the importance and nature of the activity and number or proportion and frequency of contact with LEP persons may be low and the costs and resources needed to provide language services may be high—such as in the case of a voluntary general public tour of a courthouse—in which pre-arranged language services for the particular service may not be necessary. Regardless of the type of language service provided, quality and accuracy of those services can be critical in order to avoid serious consequences to the LEP person and to the recipient. Recipients have substantial flexibility in determining the appropriate mix.

VI. Selecting Language Assistance Services

Recipients have two main ways to provide language services: oral and written language services. Quality and accuracy of the language service is critical in order to avoid serious consequences to the LEP person and to the recipient.

---

Many languages have “regionalisms,” or differences in usage. For instance, a word that may be understood to mean something in Spanish for someone from Cuba may not be so understood by someone from Mexico. In addition, because there may be languages which do not have an appropriate direct interpretation of some courtroom or legal terms and the interpreter should be so aware and be able to provide the most appropriate interpretation. The interpreter should likely make the recipient aware of the issue and the interpreter and recipient can then work to develop a consistent and appropriate set of descriptions of these terms in that language that can be used again, when appropriate.
A. **Oral Language Services (Interpretation)**

Interpretation is the act of listening to something in one language (source language) and orally translating it into another language (target language). Where interpretation is needed and is reasonable, recipients should consider some or all of the following options for providing competent interpreters in a timely manner:

- **Competence of Interpreters.** When providing oral assistance, recipients should ensure competency of the language service provider, no matter which of the strategies outlined below are used. Competency requires more than self-identification as bilingual. Some bilingual staff and community volunteers, for instance, may be able to communicate effectively in a different language when communicating information directly in that language, but not be competent to interpret in and out of English. Likewise, they may not be able to do written translations.

  Competency to interpret, however, does not necessarily mean formal certification as an interpreter, although certification is helpful. When using interpreters, recipients should ensure that they:

  - Demonstrate proficiency in and ability to communicate information accurately in both English and in the other language and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting (e.g., consecutive, simultaneous, summarization, or sight translation);
  - Have knowledge in both languages of any specialized terms or concepts peculiar to the entity’s program or activity and of any particularized vocabulary and phraseology used by the LEP person; and understand and follow confidentiality and impartiality rules to the same extent the recipient employee for whom they are interpreting and/or to the extent their position requires.
  - Understand and adhere to their role as interpreters without deviating into a role as counselor, legal advisor, or other roles (particularly in court, administrative hearings, or law enforcement contexts).

Some recipients, such as courts, may have additional self-imposed requirements for interpreters. Where individual rights depend on precise, complete, and accurate interpretation or translations, particularly in the contexts of courtrooms and custodial or other police interrogations, the use of certified interpreters is strongly encouraged. While quality and accuracy of language services is critical, the quality and accuracy of language services is nonetheless part of the appropriate mix of LEP services required. The quality and accuracy of language services in a prison hospital emergency room, for example, must be extraordinarily high, while the quality and accuracy of language services in a bicycle safety class need not meet the same exacting standards.

Finally, when interpretation is needed and is reasonable, it should be provided in a timely manner. To be meaningfully effective, language assistance should be timely. While there is no single definition for “timely” applicable to all types of interactions at all times by all types of recipients, one clear guide is that the language assistance should be provided at a time and place that avoids the effective denial of the service, benefit, or right at issue or the imposition of an undue burden on or delay in important rights, benefits, or services to the LEP person. For example, when the timeliness of services is important, such as with certain activities of DOJ recipients providing law enforcement, health, and safety services, and when important legal rights are at issue, a recipient would likely not be providing meaningful access if it had one bilingual staffer available one day a week to provide the service. Such conduct would likely result in delays for LEP persons that would be significantly greater than those for English proficient persons. Conversely, where access to or exercise of a service, benefit, or right is not effectively precluded by a reasonable delay, language assistance can likely be delayed for a reasonable period.

---

10 For those languages in which no formal accreditation or certification currently exists, courts and law enforcement agencies should consider a formal process for establishing the credentials of the interpreter.
Hiring Bilingual Staff. When particular languages are encountered often, hiring bilingual staff offers one of the best, and often most economical, options. Recipients can, for example, fill public contact positions, such as 911 operators, police officers, guards, or program directors, with staff who are bilingual and competent to communicate directly with LEP persons in their language. If bilingual staff are also used to interpret between English speakers and LEP persons, or to orally interpret written documents from English into another language, they should be competent in the skill of interpreting. Being bilingual does not necessarily mean that a person has the ability to interpret. In addition, there may be times when the role of the bilingual employee may conflict with the role of an interpreter (for instance, a bilingual law clerk would probably not be able to perform effectively the role of a courtroom or administrative hearing interpreter and law clerk at the same time, even if the law clerk were a qualified interpreter). Effective management strategies, including any appropriate adjustments in assignments and protocols for using bilingual staff, can ensure that bilingual staff are fully and appropriately utilized. When bilingual staff cannot meet all of the language service obligations of the recipient, the recipient should turn to other options.

[Hiring Staff Interpreters. Hiring interpreters may be most helpful where there is a frequent need for interpreting services in one or more languages. Depending on the facts, sometimes it may be necessary and reasonable to provide on-site interpreters to provide accurate and meaningful communication with an LEP person.]

Contracting for Interpreters. Contract interpreters may be a cost-effective option when there is no regular need for a particular language skill. In addition to commercial and other private providers, many community-based organizations and mutual assistance associations provide interpretation services for particular languages. Contracting with and providing training regarding the recipient's programs and processes to these organizations can be a cost-effective option for providing language services to LEP persons from those language groups. An example of such a case is when police officers respond to a domestic violence call. In such a case, use of family members or neighbors to interpret for the alleged victim, perpetrator, or witnesses may raise serious issues of competency, confidentiality, and conflict of interest and is thus inappropriate. While issues of competency, confidentiality, and conflict of interest in the use of family members (especially children), friends, other inmates or other detainees often make their use inappropriate, the use of these individuals as interpreters may be an appropriate option where proper application of the four factors would lead to a conclusion that recipient-provided services are not necessary. An example of this is a voluntary educational tour of a courthouse offered to the public. There, the importance and nature of the activity may be relatively low and unlikely to implicate issues of confidentiality, conflict of interest, or the need for accuracy. In addition, the resources needed and costs of providing language services may be high. In such a setting, an LEP person's use of family, friends, or others may be appropriate.

If the LEP person voluntarily chooses to provide his or her own interpreter, a recipient should consider whether a record of that choice and of the recipient's offer of assistance is appropriate. Where precise, complete,

[Written Language Services (Translation)]

and accurate interpretations or translations of information and/or testimony are critical for law enforcement, adjudicatory, or legal reasons, or where the competency of the LEP person's interpreter is not established, a recipient might decide to provide its own, independent interpreter, even if an LEP person wants to use his or her own interpreter as well. Extra caution should be exercised when the LEP person chooses to use a minor as the interpreter. While the LEP person's decision should be respected, there may be additional issues of competency, confidentiality, or conflict of interest when the choice involves using children as interpreters. The recipient should take care to ensure that the LEP person's choice is voluntary, that the LEP person is aware of the possible problems if the preferred interpreter is a minor child, and that the LEP person knows that a competent interpreter could be provided by the recipient at no cost.

B. Written Language Services (Translation)

Translation is the replacement of a written text from one language (source language) into an equivalent written text in another language (target language).
What Documents Should be Translated? After applying the four-factor analysis, a recipient may determine that an effective LEP plan for its particular program or activity includes the translation of vital written materials into the language of each frequently-encountered LEP group eligible to be served and/or likely to be affected by the recipient’s program.

Such written materials could include, for example:

- Consent and complaint forms
- Intake forms with the potential for important consequences
- Written notices of rights, denial, loss, or decreases in benefits or services, parole, and other hearings
- Notices of disciplinary action
- Notices advising LEP persons of free language assistance
- Prison rule books
- Written tests that do not assess English language competency, but test competency for a particular license, job, or skill for which knowing English is not required
- Applications to participate in a recipient’s program or activity or to receive recipient benefits or services.

Whether or not a document (or the information it solicits) is “vital” may depend upon the importance of the program, information, encounter, or service involved, and the consequence to the LEP person if the information in question is not provided accurately or in a timely manner. For instance, applications for bicycle safety courses should not generally be considered vital, whereas applications for drug and alcohol counseling in prison could be considered vital. Where appropriate, recipients are encouraged to create a plan for consistently determining, over time and across its various activities, what documents are “vital” to the meaningful access of the LEP populations they serve.

Classifying a document as vital or non-vital is sometimes difficult, especially in the case of outreach materials like brochures or other information on rights and services. Awareness of rights or services is an important part of “meaningful access.” Lack of awareness that a particular program, right, or service exists may effectively deny LEP individuals meaningful access. Thus, where a recipient is engaged in community outreach activities in furtherance of its activities, it should regularly assess the needs of the populations frequently encountered or affected by the program or activity to determine whether certain critical outreach materials should be translated. Community organizations may be helpful in determining what outreach materials may be most helpful to translate. In addition, the recipient should consider whether translations of outreach material may be made more effective when done in tandem with other outreach methods, including utilizing the ethnic media, schools, religious, and community organizations to spread a message.

Sometimes a document includes both vital and non-vital information. This may be the case when the document is very large. It may also be the case when the title and a phone number for obtaining more information on the contents of the document in frequently-encountered languages other than English is critical, but the document is sent out to the general public and cannot reasonably be translated into many languages. Thus, vital information may include, for instance, the provision of information in appropriate languages other than English regarding where a LEP person might obtain an interpretation or translation of the document.

Into What Languages Should Documents be Translated? The languages spoken by the LEP individuals with whom the recipient has contact determine the languages into which vital documents should be translated. A distinction should be made, however, between languages that are frequently encountered by a recipient and less commonly-encountered languages. Many recipients serve communities in large cities or across the country. They regularly serve LEP persons who speak dozens and sometimes over 100 different languages. To translate all written materials into all of those languages is unrealistic. Although recent technological advances have made it easier for recipients to store and share translated documents, such an undertaking would incur substantial costs and require substantial resources. Nevertheless, well-substantiated claims of lack of resources to translate all vital documents into dozens of languages do not necessarily relieve the recipient of the obligation to translate those documents into at least several of the more frequently-encountered languages and to set benchmarks for continued translations into the remaining languages over time.
As a result, the extent of the recipient’s obligation to provide written translations of documents should be
determined by the recipient on a case-by-case basis, looking at the totality of the circumstances in light of the
four-factor analysis. Because translation is a one-time expense, consideration should be given to whether the
upfront cost of translating a document (as opposed to oral interpretation) should be amortized over the likely
lifespan of the document when applying this four-factor analysis.

Safe Harbor. Many recipients would like to ensure with greater certainty that they comply with their obligations
to provide written translations in languages other than English. Paragraphs (a) and (b) outline the circumstances
that can provide a “safe harbor” for recipients regarding the requirements for translation of written materials. A
“safe harbor” means that if a recipient provides written translations under these circumstances, such action will
be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s written-translation obligations.

The failure to provide written translations under the circumstances outlined in paragraphs (a) and (b) does not
mean there is non-compliance. Rather, they provide a common starting point for recipients to consider whether
and at what point the importance of the service, benefit, or activity involved; the nature of the information sought;
and the number or proportion of LEP persons served call for written translations of commonly-used forms into
frequently-encountered languages other than English. Thus, these paragraphs merely provide a guide for
recipients that would like greater certainty of compliance than can be

provided by a fact-intensive, four-factor analysis.

Example: Even if the safe harbors are not used, if written translation of a certain document(s) would be so
burdensome as to defeat the legitimate objectives of its program, the translation of the written materials is not
necessary. Other ways of providing meaningful access, such as effective oral interpretation of certain vital
documents, might be acceptable under such circumstances.

Safe Harbor. The following actions will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s
written-translation obligations:

(a) The DOJ recipient provides written translations of vital documents for each eligible LEP language
group that constitutes five percent or 1,000, whichever is less, of the population of persons eligible to
be served or likely to be affected or encountered. Translation of other documents, if needed, can be
provided orally; or

(b) If there are fewer than 50 persons in a language group that reaches the five percent trigger in (a), the
recipient does not translate vital written materials but provides written notice in the primary language of
the LEP language group of the right to receive competent oral interpretation of those written materials,
free of cost.

These safe harbor provisions apply to the translation of written documents only. They do not affect the
requirement to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals through competent oral interpreters where oral
language services are needed and are reasonable. For example, correctional facilities should, where appropri-
ate, ensure that prison rules have been explained to LEP inmates, at orientation, for instance, prior to taking
disciplinary action against them.

Competence of Translators. As with oral interpreters, translators of written documents should be competent.
Many of the same considerations apply. However, the skill of translating is very different from the skill of
interpreting, and a person who is a competent interpreter may or may not be competent to translate.
Particularly where legal or other vital documents are being translated, competence can often be achieved by use of certified translators. Certification or accreditation may not always be possible or necessary. Competence can often be ensured by having a second, independent translator “check” the work of the primary translator. Alternatively, one translator can translate the document, and a second, independent translator could translate it back into English to check that the appropriate meaning has been conveyed. This is called “back translation.”

Translators should understand the expected reading level of the audience and, where appropriate, have fundamental knowledge about the target language group’s vocabulary and phraseology. Sometimes direct translation of materials results in a translation that is written at a much more difficult level than the English language version or has no relevant equivalent meaning. Community organizations may be able to help consider whether a document is written at a good level for the audience. Likewise, consistency in the words and phrases used to translate terms of art, legal, or other technical concepts helps avoid confusion by LEP individuals and may reduce costs.

Creating or using already-created glossaries of commonly-used terms may be useful for LEP persons and translators and cost effective for the recipient. Providing translators with examples of previous accurate translations of similar material by the recipient, other recipients, or Federal agencies may be helpful.

While quality and accuracy of translation services is critical, the quality and accuracy of translation services is nonetheless part of the appropriate mix of LEP services required. For instance, documents that are simple and have The permanent nature of written translations, however, imposes additional responsibility on the recipient to ensure that the quality and accuracy permit meaningful access by LEP persons.

VII. Elements of Effective Plan on Language Assistance for LEP Persons

After completing the four-factor analysis and deciding what language assistance services are appropriate, a recipient should develop an implementation plan to address the identified needs of the LEP populations they serve. Recipients have considerable flexibility in developing this plan. The development and maintenance of a periodically-updated written plan on language assistance for LEP persons (“LEP plan”) for use by recipient employees serving the public will likely be the most appropriate and cost-effective means of documenting compliance and providing a framework for the provision of timely and reasonable language assistance. Moreover, such written plans would likely provide additional benefits to a recipient’s managers in the areas of training, administration, planning, and budgeting.

These benefits should lead most recipients to document in a written LEP plan their language assistance services, and how staff and LEP persons can access those services. Despite these benefits, certain DOJ recipients, such as recipients serving very few LEP persons and recipients with very limited resources, may choose not to develop a written LEP plan. However, the absence of a written LEP plan does not obviate the underlying obligation to ensure meaningful access by LEP persons to a recipient’s program or activities. Accordingly, in the event that a recipient elects not to develop a written plan, it should consider alternative ways to articulate in some other reasonable manner a plan for providing meaningful access. Entities having significant contact with LEP persons, such as schools, religious organizations, community groups, and groups working with new immigrants can be very helpful in providing important input into this planning process from the beginning.

12 For those languages in which no formal accreditation currently exists, a particular level of membership in a professional translation association can provide some indicator of professionalism.
13 For instance, there may be languages which do not have an appropriate direct translation of some courtroom or legal terms and the translator should be able to provide an appropriate translation. The translator should likely also make the recipient aware of this. Recipients can then work with translators to develop a consistent and appropriate set of descriptions of these terms in that language that can be used again, when appropriate. Recipients will find it more effective and less costly if they try to maintain consistency in the words and phrases used to translate terms of art and legal or other technical concepts. Creating or using already-created glossaries of commonly used terms may be useful for LEP persons and translators and cost effective for the recipient. Providing translators with examples of previous translations of similar material by the recipient, other recipients, or Federal agencies may be helpful.
The following five steps may be helpful in designing an LEP plan and are typically part of effective implementation plans.

(1) Identifying LEP Individuals Who Need Language Assistance

The first two factors in the four-factor analysis require an assessment of the number or proportion of LEP individuals eligible to be served or encountered and the frequency of encounters. This requires recipients to identify LEP persons with whom it has contact.

One way to determine the language of communication is to use language identification cards (or “I speak cards”), which invite LEP persons to identify their language needs to staff. Such cards, for instance, might say “I speak Spanish” in both Spanish and English, “I speak Vietnamese” in both English and Vietnamese, etc. To reduce costs of compliance, the Federal government has made a set of these cards available on the Internet. The Census Bureau “I speak card” can be found and downloaded at http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm. When records are normally kept of past interactions with members of the public, the language of the LEP person can be included as part of the record. In addition to helping employees identify the language of LEP persons they encounter, this process will help in future applications of the first two factors of the four-factor analysis. In addition, posting notices in commonly encountered languages notifying LEP persons of language assistance will encourage them to self-identify.

(2) Language Assistance Measures

An effective LEP plan would likely include information about the ways in which language assistance will be provided. For instance, recipients may want to include information on at least the following:

- Types of language services available.
- How staff can obtain those services.
- How to respond to LEP callers.
- How to respond to written communications from LEP persons.
- How to respond to LEP individuals who have in-person contact with recipient staff.
- How to ensure competency of interpreters and translation services.

(3) Training Staff

Staff should know their obligations to provide meaningful access to information and services for LEP persons. An effective LEP plan would likely include training to ensure that:

- Staff know about LEP policies and procedures.
- Staff having contact with the public (or those in a recipient’s custody) are trained to work effectively with in-person and telephone interpreters.

Recipients may want to include this training as part of the orientation for new employees. It is important to ensure that all employees in public contact positions (or having contact with those in a recipient’s custody) are properly trained. Recipients have flexibility in deciding the manner in which the training is provided. The more frequent the contact with LEP persons, the greater the need will be for in-depth training. Staff with little or no contact with LEP persons may only have to be aware of an LEP plan. However, management staff, even if they do not interact regularly with LEP persons, should be fully aware of and understand the plan so they can reinforce its importance and ensure its implementation by staff.
(4) Providing Notice to LEP Persons

Once an agency has decided, based on the four factors, that it will provide language services, it is important for the recipient to let LEP persons know that those services are available and that they are free of charge. Recipients should provide this notice in a language LEP persons will understand. Examples of notification that recipients should consider include:

- Posting signs in intake areas and other entry points. When language assistance is needed to ensure meaningful access to information and services, it is important to provide notice in appropriate languages in intake areas or initial points of contact so that LEP persons can learn how to access those language services. This is particularly true in areas with high volumes of LEP persons seeking access to certain health, safety, or law enforcement services or activities run by DOJ recipients. For instance, signs in intake offices could state that free language assistance is available. The signs should be translated into the most common languages encountered. They should explain how to get the language help.14
- Stating in outreach documents that language services are available from the agency. Announcements could be in, for instance, brochures, booklets, and in outreach and recruitment information. These statements should be translated into the most common languages and could be “tagged” onto the front of common documents.
- Working with community-based organizations and other stakeholders to inform LEP individuals of the recipients’ services, including the availability of language assistance services.
- Using a telephone voice mail menu. The menu could be in the most common languages encountered. It should provide information about available language assistance services and how to get them.
- Including notices in local newspapers in languages other than English.
- Providing notices on non-English-language radio and television stations about the available language assistance services and how to get them.
- Presentations and/or notices at schools and religious organizations.

(5) Monitoring and Updating the LEP Plan

Recipients should, where appropriate, have a process for determining, on an ongoing basis, whether new documents, programs, services, and activities need to be made accessible for LEP individuals, and they may want to provide notice of any changes in services to the LEP public and to employees. In addition, recipients should consider whether changes in demographics, types of services, or other needs require annual reevaluation of their LEP plan. Less frequent reevaluation may be more appropriate where demographics, services, and needs are more static. One good way to evaluate the LEP plan is to seek feedback from the community. In their reviews, recipients may want to consider assessing changes in:

- Current LEP populations in service area or population affected or encountered.
- Frequency of encounters with LEP language groups.
- Nature and importance of activities to LEP persons.
- Availability of resources, including technological advances and sources of additional resources, and the costs imposed.
- Whether existing assistance is meeting the needs of LEP persons.
- Whether staff knows and understands the LEP plan and how to implement it.
- Whether identified sources for assistance are still available and viable. In addition to these five elements, effective plans set clear goals, management accountability, and opportunities for community input and planning throughout the process.

---

14 The Social Security Administration has made such signs available at http://www.ssa.gov/multilanguage/langlist1.htm. These signs could, for example, be modified for recipient use.
VIII. Voluntary Compliance Effort

The goal for Title VI and Title VI regulatory enforcement is to achieve voluntary compliance. The requirement to provide meaningful access to LEP persons is enforced and implemented by DOJ through the procedures identified in the Title VI regulations. These procedures include complaint investigations, compliance reviews, efforts to secure voluntary compliance, and technical assistance.

The Title VI regulations provide that DOJ will investigate whenever it receives a complaint, report, or other information that alleges or indicates possible noncompliance with Title VI or its regulations. If the investigation results in a finding of compliance, DOJ will inform the recipient in writing of this determination, including the basis for the determination. DOJ uses voluntary mediation to resolve most complaints. However, if a case is fully investigated and results in a finding of noncompliance, DOJ must inform the recipient of the noncompliance through a Letter of Findings that sets out the areas of noncompliance and the steps that must be taken to correct the noncompliance. It must attempt to secure voluntary compliance through informal means. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, DOJ must secure compliance through the termination of Federal assistance after the DOJ recipient has been given an opportunity for an administrative hearing and/or by referring the matter to a DOJ litigation section to seek injunctive relief or pursue other enforcement proceedings. DOJ engages in voluntary compliance efforts and provides technical assistance to recipients at all stages of an investigation. During these efforts, DOJ proposes reasonable timetables for achieving compliance and consults with and assists recipients in exploring cost-effective ways of coming into compliance. In determining a recipient’s compliance with the Title VI regulations, DOJ’s primary concern is to ensure that the recipient’s policies and procedures provide meaningful access for LEP persons to the recipient’s programs and activities.

While all recipients must work toward building systems that will ensure access for LEP individuals, DOJ acknowledges that the implementation of a comprehensive system to serve LEP individuals is a process and that a system will evolve over time as it is implemented and periodically reevaluated. As recipients take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to federally assisted programs and activities for LEP persons, DOJ will look favorably on intermediate steps recipients take that are consistent with this Guidance, and that, as part of a broader implementation plan or schedule, move their service delivery system toward providing full access to LEP persons. This does not excuse noncompliance but instead recognizes that full compliance in all areas of a recipient’s activities and for all potential language minority groups may reasonably require a series of implementing actions over a period of time. However, in developing any phased implementation schedule, DOJ recipients should ensure that the provision of appropriate assistance for significant LEP populations or with respect to activities having a significant impact on the health, safety, legal rights, or livelihood of beneficiaries is addressed first. Recipients are encouraged to document their efforts to provide LEP persons with meaningful access to federally assisted programs and activities.

IX. Application to Specific Types of Recipients

Appendix A of this Guidance provides examples of how the meaningful access requirement of the Title VI regulations applies to law enforcement, corrections, courts, and other recipients of DOJ assistance.

A. State and Local Law Enforcement

Appendix A further explains how law enforcement recipients can apply the four factors to a range of encounters with the public. The responsibility for providing language services differs with different types of encounters.
Appendix A helps recipients identify the population they should consider when considering the types of services to provide. It then provides guidance and examples of applying the four factors. For instance, it gives examples on how to apply this guidance to:

- Receiving and responding to requests for help
- Enforcement stops short of arrest and field investigations
- Custodial interrogations
- Intake/detention Community outreach

B. Departments of Corrections

Appendix A also helps departments of corrections understand how to apply the four factors. For instance, it gives examples of LEP access in:

- Intake
- Disciplinary action
- Health and safety
- Participation in classes or other programs affecting length of sentence
- English as a Second Language (ESL) Classes
- Community corrections programs

C. Other Types of Recipients

Appendix A also applies the four factors and gives examples for other types of recipients. Those include, for example:

- Courts
- Juvenile Justice Programs
- Domestic Violence Prevention/ Treatment Programs
Appendix A—Application of LEP Guidance for DOJ Recipients to Specific Types of Recipients

While a wide range of entities receive Federal financial assistance through DOJ, most of DOJ’s assistance goes to law enforcement agencies, including State and local police and sheriffs’ departments, and to State departments of corrections. Sections A and B below provide examples of how these two major types of DOJ recipients might apply the four-factor analysis. Section C provides examples for other types of recipients. The examples in this Appendix are not meant to be exhaustive and may not apply in many situations.

The requirements of the Title VI regulations, as clarified by this Guidance, supplement, but do not supplant, constitutional and other statutory or regulatory provisions that may require LEP services. Thus, a proper application of the four-factor analysis and compliance with the Title VI regulations does not replace constitutional or other statutory protections mandating warnings and notices in languages other than English in the criminal justice context. Rather, this Guidance clarifies the Title VI regulatory obligation to address, in appropriate circumstances and in a reasonable manner, the language assistance needs of LEP individuals beyond those required by the Constitution or statutes and regulations other than the Title VI regulations.

A. State and Local Law Enforcement

For the vast majority of the public, exposure to law enforcement begins and ends with interactions with law enforcement personnel discharging their duties while on patrol, responding to a request for services, talking to witnesses or conducting community outreach activities. For a much smaller number, that exposure includes a visit to a station house. And for an important but even smaller number, that visit to the station house results in one’s exposure to the criminal justice, judicial, or juvenile justice system.

The common thread running through these and other interactions between the public and law enforcement is the exchange of information. Where police and sheriffs’ departments receive Federal financial assistance, these departments have an obligation to provide LEP services to LEP individuals to ensure that they have meaningful access to the system, including, for example, understanding rights and accessing police assistance. Language barriers can, for instance, prevent victims from effectively reporting crimes to the police and hinder police investigations of reported crimes. For example, failure to communicate effectively with a victim of domestic violence can result in reliance on the batterer or a minor child and failure to identify and protect against harm.

Many police and sheriffs’ departments already provide language services in a wide variety of circumstances to obtain information effectively, to build trust and

relationships with the community, and to contribute to the safety of law enforcement personnel. For example, many police departments already have available printed Miranda rights in languages other than English as well as interpreters available to inform LEP persons of their rights and to interpret police interviews. In areas where significant LEP populations reside, law enforcement officials already may have forms and notices in languages other than English or they may employ bilingual law enforcement officers, intake personnel, counselors, and support staff. These experiences can form a strong basis for applying the four-factor analysis and complying with the Title VI regulations.

1. General Principles

The touchstone of the four-factor analysis is reasonableness based upon the specific purposes, needs, and capabilities of the law enforcement service under review and an appreciation of the nature and particularized needs of the LEP population served. Accordingly, the analysis cannot provide a single uniform answer on how

1 The Department’s Federal Bureau of Investigation makes written versions of those rights available in several different languages. Of course, where literacy is of concern, these are most useful in assisting an interpreter in using consistent terms when providing Miranda warnings orally.
service to LEP persons must be provided in all programs or activities in all situations or whether such service need be provided at all. Knowledge of local conditions and community needs becomes critical in determining the type and level of language services needed.

Before giving specific examples, several general points should assist law enforcement in correctly applying the analysis to the wide range of services employed in their particular jurisdictions.

a. Permanent Versus Seasonal Populations
In many communities, resident populations change over time or season. For example, in some resort communities, populations swell during peak vacation periods, many times exceeding the number of permanent residents of the jurisdiction. In other communities, primarily agricultural areas, transient populations of workers will require increased law enforcement services during the relevant harvest season. This dynamic demographic ebb and flow can also dramatically change the size and nature of the LEP community likely to come into contact with law enforcement personnel. Thus, law enforcement officials may not want to limit their analysis to numbers and percentages of permanent residents. In assessing factor one—the number or proportion of LEP individuals—police departments should consider any significant but temporary changes in a jurisdiction’s demographics.

Example: A rural jurisdiction has a permanent population of 30,000, 7% of which is Hispanic. Based on demographic data and on information from the contiguous school district, of that number, only 15% are estimated to be LEP individuals. Thus, the total estimated permanent LEP population is 315 or approximately 1% of the total permanent population. Under the four-factor analysis, a sheriffs’ department could reasonably conclude that the small number of LEP persons makes the affirmative translation of documents and/or employment of bilingual staff unnecessary. However, during the spring and summer planting and harvest seasons, the local population swells to 40,000 due to the influx of seasonal agricultural workers. Of this transitional number, about 75% are Hispanic and about 50% of that number are LEP individuals. This information comes from the schools and a local migrant worker community group. Thus, during the harvest season, the jurisdiction’s LEP population increases to over 10% of all residents. In this case, the department may want to consider whether it is required to translate vital written documents into Spanish. In addition, this increase in LEP population during those seasons makes it important for the jurisdiction to review its interpretation services to ensure meaningful access for LEP individuals.

b. Target Audiences
For most law enforcement services, the target audience is defined in geographic rather than programmatic terms. However, some services may be targeted to reach a particular audience (e.g., elementary school children, elderly, residents of high crime areas, minority communities, small business owners/operators). Also, within the larger geographic area covered by a police department, certain precincts or portions of precincts may have concentrations of LEP persons. In these cases, even if the overall number or proportion of LEP individuals in the district is low, the frequency of contact may be foreseeably higher for certain areas or programs. Thus, the second factor—frequency of contact—should be considered in light of the specific program or the geographic area being served.

Example: A police department that receives funds from the DOJ Office of Justice Programs initiates a program to increase awareness and understanding of police services among elementary school age children in high crime areas of the jurisdiction. This program involves “Officer in the Classroom” presentations at elementary schools located in areas of high poverty. The population of the jurisdiction is estimated to include only 3% LEP individuals. However, the LEP population at the target schools is 35%, the vast majority of whom are Vietnamese speakers. In applying the four-factor analysis, the higher LEP language group populations of the target schools and the frequency of contact within the program with LEP students in those schools, not the LEP population generally, should be used in determining the nature of the LEP needs of that particular program. Further, because the Vietnamese LEP population is concentrated in one or two main areas of town, the police department should consider whether to apply the four-factor analysis to other services provided by the police department.
c. Importance of Service/Information
Given the critical role law enforcement plays in maintaining quality of life and property, traditional law enforcement and protective services rank high on the critical/non-critical continuum. However, this does not mean that information about, or provided by, each of the myriad services and activities performed by law enforcement officials must be equally available in languages other than English. While clearly important to the ultimate success of law enforcement, certain community outreach activities do not have the same direct impact on the provision of core law enforcement services as the activities of 911 lines or law enforcement officials’ ability to respond to requests for assistance while on patrol, to communicate basic information to suspects, etc. Nevertheless, with the rising importance of community partnerships and community-based programming as a law enforcement technique, the need for language services with respect to these programs should be considered in applying the four-factor analysis.

d. Interpreters
Just as with other recipients, law enforcement recipients have a variety of options for providing language services. Under certain circumstances, when interpreters are required and recipients should provide competent interpreter services free of cost to the LEP person, LEP persons should be advised that they may choose either to secure the assistance of an interpreter of their own choosing, at their own expense, or a competent interpreter provided by the recipient.

If the LEP person decides to provide his or her own interpreter, the provision of this choice to the LEP person and the LEP person's election should be documented in any written record generated with respect to the LEP person. While an LEP person may sometimes look to bilingual family members or friends or other persons with whom they are comfortable for language assistance, there are many situations where an LEP person might want to rely upon recipient-supplied interpretative services. For example, such individuals may not be available when and where they are needed, or may not have the ability to interpret program-specific technical information. Alternatively, an individual may feel uncomfortable revealing or describing sensitive, confidential, or potentially embarrassing medical, law enforcement (e.g., sexual or violent assaults), family, or financial information to a family member, friend, or member of the local community. Similarly, there may be situations where a recipient’s own interests justify the provision of an interpreter regardless of whether the LEP individual also provides his or her own interpreter.

For example, where precise, complete and accurate translations of information and/or testimony are critical for law enforcement, adjudicatory or legal reasons, a recipient might decide to provide its own, independent Interpreter, even if an LEP person wants to use their own interpreter as well.

In emergency situations that are not reasonably foreseeable, the recipient may have to temporarily rely on non-recipient-provided language services. Reliance on children is especially discouraged unless there is an extreme emergency and no preferable interpreters are available.

While all language services need to be competent, the greater the potential consequences, the greater the need to monitor interpretation services for quality. For instance, it is important that interpreters in custodial interrogations be highly competent to translate legal and other law enforcement concepts, as well as be extremely accurate in their interpretation. It may be sufficient, however, for a desk clerk who is bilingual but not skilled at interpreting to help an LEP person figure out to whom he or she needs to talk about setting up a neighborhood watch.

2. Applying the Four-Factor Analysis Along the Law Enforcement Continuum

While all police activities are important, the four-factor analysis requires some prioritizing so that language services are targeted where most needed because of the nature and importance of the particular law enforcement activity involved. In addition, because of the "reasonableness" standard, and frequency of contact and resources/costs factors, the obligation to provide language services increases where the importance of the activity is greater.
Under this framework, then, critical areas for language assistance could include 911 calls, custodial interrogation, and health and safety issues for persons within the control of the police. These activities should be considered the most important under the four-factor analysis. Systems for receiving and investigating complaints from the public are important. Often very important are routine patrol activities, receiving non-emergency information regarding potential crimes, and ticketing. Community outreach activities are hard to categorize, but generally they do not rise to the same level of importance as the other activities listed. However, with the importance of community partnerships and community-based programming as a law enforcement technique, the need for language services with respect to these programs should be considered in applying the four-factor analysis. Police departments have a great deal of flexibility in determining how to best address their outreach to LEP populations.

**a. Receiving and Responding to Requests for Assistance**

LEP persons must have meaningful access to police services when they are victims of or witnesses to alleged criminal activity. Effective reporting systems transform victims, witnesses, or bystanders into assistants in law enforcement and investigation processes. Given the critical role the public plays in reporting crimes or directing limited law enforcement resources to time-sensitive emergency or public safety situations, efforts to address the language assistance needs of LEP individuals could have a significant impact on improving responsiveness, effectiveness, and safety.

Emergency service lines for the public, or 911 lines, operated by agencies that receive Federal financial assistance must be accessible to persons who are LEP. This will mean different things to different jurisdictions. For instance, in large cities with significant LEP communities, the 911 line may have operators who are bilingual and capable of accurately interpreting in high stress situations. Smaller cities or areas with small LEP populations should still have a plan for serving callers who are LEP, but the LEP plan and implementation may involve a telephonic interpretation service that is fast enough and reliable enough to attend to the emergency situation, or include some other accommodation short of hiring bilingual operators.

*Example:* A large city provides bilingual operators for the most frequently encountered languages, and uses a commercial telephone interpretation service when it receives calls from LEP persons who speak other languages. Ten percent of the city’s population is LEP, and sixty percent of the LEP population speaks Spanish. In addition to 911 service, the city has a 311 line for non-emergency police services. The 311 Center has Spanish speaking operators available, and uses a language bank, staffed by the city’s bilingual city employees who are competent translators, for other non-English-speaking callers. The city also has a campaign to educate non-English speakers when to use 311 instead of 911. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

**b. Enforcement Stops Short of Arrest and Field Investigations**

Field enforcement includes, for example, traffic stops, pedestrian stops, serving warrants and restraining orders, Terry stops, activities in aid of other jurisdictions or Federal agencies (e.g., fugitive arrests or INS detentions), and crowd/traffic control. Because of the diffuse nature of these activities, the reasonableness standard allows for great flexibility in providing meaningful access. Nevertheless, the ability of law enforcement agencies to discharge fully and effectively their enforcement and crime interdiction mission requires the ability to communicate instructions, commands, and notices. For example, a routine traffic stop can become a difficult situation if an officer is unable to communicate effectively the reason for the stop, the need for identification or other information, and the meaning of any written citation. Requests for consent to search are meaningless if the request is not understood. Similarly, crowd control commands will be wholly ineffective where significant numbers of people in a crowd cannot understand the meaning of law enforcement commands.

Given the wide range of possible situations in which law enforcement in the field can take place, it is impossible to equip every officer with the tools necessary to respond to every possible LEP scenario. Rather, in applying the four factors to field enforcement, the goal should be to implement measures addressing the language needs of significant LEP populations in the most likely, common, and important situations, as consistent with the recipients’ resources and costs.

*Example:* A police department serves a jurisdiction with a significant number of LEP individuals residing in one or more precincts, and it is routinely asked to provide crowd control services at community events or demonstrations in those precincts. If it is otherwise consistent with the requirements of the four-factor analysis, the police
department should assess how it will discharge its crowd control duties in a language-appropriate manner. Among the possible approaches are plans to assign bilingual officers, basic language training of all officers in common law enforcement commands, the use of devices that provide audio commands in the predictable languages, or the distribution of translated written materials for use by officers.

Field investigations include neighborhood canvassing, witness identification and interviewing, investigative or Terry stops, and similar activities designed to solicit and obtain information from the community or particular persons. Encounters with LEP individuals will often be less predictable in field investigations. However, the jurisdiction should still assess the potential for contact with LEP individuals in the course of field investigations and investigative stops, identify the LEP language group(s) most likely to be encountered, and provide, if it is consistent with the four-factor analysis, its officers with sufficient interpretation and/or translation resources to ensure that lack of English proficiency does not impede otherwise proper investigations or unduly burden LEP individuals.

Example: A police department in a moderately large city includes a precinct that serves an area which includes significant LEP populations whose native languages are Spanish, Korean, and Tagalog. Law enforcement officials could reasonably consider the adoption of a plan assigning bilingual investigative officers to the precinct and/or creating a resource list of department employees competent to interpret and ready to assist officers by phone or radio. This could be combined with developing language-appropriate written materials, such as consents to searches or statements of rights, for use by its officers where LEP individuals are literate in their languages. In certain circumstances, it may also be helpful to have telephonic interpretation service access where other options are not successful and safety and availability of phone access permit.

Example: A police department receives Federal financial assistance and serves a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood. It routinely sends officers on domestic violence calls. The police department is in a State in which English has been declared the official language. The police therefore determine that they cannot provide language services to LEP persons. Thus, when the victim of domestic violence speaks only Spanish and the perpetrator speaks English, the officers have no way to speak with the victim so they only get the perpetrator’s side of the story. The failure to communicate effectively with the victim results in further abuse and failure to charge the batterer. The police department should be aware that despite the state’s official English law, the Title VI regulations apply to it. Thus, the police department should provide meaningful access for LEP persons.
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c. Custodial Interrogations
Custodial interrogations of unrepresented LEP individuals trigger constitutional rights that this Guidance is not designed to address. Given the importance of being able to communicate effectively under such circumstances, law enforcement recipients should ensure competent and free language services for LEP individuals in such situations. Law enforcement agencies are strongly encouraged to create a written plan on language assistance for LEP persons in this area. In addition, in formulating a plan for effectively communicating with LEP individuals, agencies should strongly consider whether qualified independent interpreters would be more appropriate during custodial interrogations than law enforcement personnel themselves.2

Example: A large city police department institutes an LEP plan that requires arresting officers to procure a qualified interpreter for any custodial interrogation, notification of rights, or taking of a formal statement where the suspect’s legal rights could be adversely impacted. When considering whether an interpreter is qualified, the LEP plan discourages use of police officers as interpreters in interrogations except under circumstances in which the LEP individual is informed of the officer’s dual role and the reliability of the interpretation is verified, such as, for example, where the officer has been trained and tested in interpreting and tape recordings are made of the entire interview. In determining whether an interpreter is qualified, the jurisdiction uses the analysis noted above. These actions would constitute strong evidence of compliance.

2 Some State laws prohibit police officers from serving as interpreters during custodial interrogation of suspects.
d. Intake/Detention
State or local law enforcement agencies that arrest LEP persons should consider the inherent communication impediments to gathering information from the LEP arrestee through an intake or booking process. Aside from the basic information, such as the LEP arrestee’s name and address, law enforcement agencies should evaluate their ability to communicate with the LEP arrestee about his or her medical condition. Because medical screening questions are commonly used to elicit information on the arrestee’s medical needs, suicidal inclinations, presence of contagious diseases, potential illness, resulting symptoms upon withdrawal from certain medications, or the need to segregate the arrestee from other prisoners, it is important for law enforcement agencies to consider how to communicate effectively with an LEP arrestee at this stage. In jurisdictions with few bilingual officers or in situations where the LEP person speaks a language not encountered very frequently, telephonic interpretation services may provide the most cost effective and efficient method of communication.

e. Community Outreach
Community outreach activities increasingly are recognized as important to the ultimate success of more traditional duties. Thus, an application of the four-factor analysis to community outreach activities can play an important role in ensuring that the purpose of these activities (to improve police/community relations and advance law enforcement objectives) is not thwarted due to the failure to address the language needs of LEP persons.

Example: A police department initiates a program of domestic counseling in an effort to reduce the number or intensity of domestic violence interactions. A review of domestic violence records in the city reveals that 25% of all domestic violence responses are to minority areas and 30% of those responses involve interactions with one or more LEP persons, most of whom speak the same language. After completing the four-factor analysis, the department should take reasonable steps to make the counseling accessible to LEP individuals. For instance, the department could seek bilingual counselors (for whom they provided training in translation) for some of the counseling positions. In addition, the department could have an agreement with a local university in which bilingual social work majors who are competent in interpreting, as well as language majors who are trained by the department in basic domestic violence sensitivity and counseling, are used as interpreters when the in-house bilingual staff cannot cover the need. Interpreters under such circumstances should sign a confidentiality agreement with the department. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

Example: A large city has initiated an outreach program designed to address a problem of robberies of Vietnamese homes by Vietnamese gangs. One strategy is to work with community groups and banks and others to help allay traditional fears in the community of putting money and other valuables in banks. Because a large portion of the target audience is Vietnamese speaking and LEP, the department contracts with a bilingual community liaison competent in the skill of translating to help with outreach activities. This action constitutes strong evidence of compliance.

B. Departments of Corrections/Jails/ Detention Centers
Departments of corrections that receive Federal financial assistance from DOJ must provide LEP prisoners with meaningful access to benefits and services within the program. In order to do so, corrections departments, like other recipients, must apply the four-factor analysis.

1. General Principles
Departments of corrections also have a wide variety of options in providing translation services appropriate to the particular situation. Bilingual staff competent in interpreting, in person or by phone, pose one option. Additionally, particular prisons may have agreements with local colleges and universities, interpreter services,

---

3 In this Guidance, the terms “prisoners” or “inmates” include all of those individuals, including Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) detainees and juveniles, who are held in a facility operated by a recipient. Certain statutory, regulatory, or constitutional mandates/rights may apply only to juveniles, such as educational rights, including those for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency. Because a decision by a recipient or a Federal, state, or local entity to make an activity compulsory serves as strong evidence of the program’s importance, the obligation to provide language services may differ depending upon whether the LEP person is a juvenile or an adult inmate.
and/or community organizations to provide paid or volunteer competent translators under agreements of confidentiality and impartiality. Telephonic interpretation services may offer a prudent oral interpreting option for prisons with very few and/or infrequent prisoners in a particular language group. Reliance on fellow prisoners is generally not appropriate. Reliance on fellow prisoners should only be an option in unforeseeable emergency circumstances; when the LEP inmate signs a waiver that is in his/her language and in a form designed for him/her to understand; or where the topic of communication is not sensitive, confidential, important, or technical in nature and the prisoner is competent in the skill of interpreting.

In addition, a department of corrections that receives Federal financial assistance would be ultimately responsible for ensuring that LEP inmates have meaningful access within a prison run by a private or other entity with which the department has entered into a contract. The department may provide the staff and materials necessary to provide required language services, or it may choose to require the entity with which it contracted to provide the services itself.

2. Applying the Four Factors Along the Corrections Continuum

As with law enforcement activities, critical and predictable contact with LEP individuals poses the greatest obligation for language services. Corrections facilities have somewhat greater abilities to assess the language needs of those they encounter, although inmate populations may change rapidly in some areas. Contact affecting health and safety, length of stay, and discipline likely present the most critical situations under the four-factor analysis.

a. Assessment

Each department of corrections that receives Federal financial assistance should assess the number of LEP prisoners who are in the system, in which prisons they are located, and the languages he or she speaks. Each prisoner’s LEP status, and the language he or she speaks, should be placed in his or her file. Although this Guidance and Title VI are not meant to address literacy levels, agencies should be aware of literacy problems so that LEP services are provided in a way that is meaningful and useful (e.g., translated written materials are of little use to a non-literate inmate). After the initial assessment, new LEP prisoners should be identified at intake or orientation, and the data should be updated accordingly.

b. Intake/Orientation

Intake/Orientation plays a critical role not merely in the system’s identification of LEP prisoners, but in providing those prisoners with fundamental information about their obligations to comply with system regulations, participate in education and training, receive appropriate medical treatment, and enjoy recreation. Even if only one prisoner doesn’t understand English, that prisoner should likely be given the opportunity to be informed of the rules, obligations, and opportunities in a manner designed effectively to communicate these matters. An appropriate analogy is the obligation to communicate effectively with deaf prisoners, which is most frequently accomplished through sign language interpreters or written materials. Not every prison will use the same method for providing language assistance. Prisons with large numbers of Spanish-speaking LEP prisoners, for example, may choose to translate written rules, notices, and other important orientation material into Spanish with oral instructions, whereas prisons with very few such inmates may choose to rely upon a telephonic interpretation service or qualified community volunteers to assist.

Example: The department of corrections in a State with a 5% Haitian Creole-speaking LEP corrections population and an 8% Spanish-speaking LEP population receives Federal financial assistance to expand one of its prisons. The department of corrections has developed an intake video in Haitian Creole and another in Spanish for all of the prisons within the department to use when orienting new prisoners who are LEP and speak one of those languages. In addition, the department provides inmates with an opportunity to ask

---

questions and discuss intake information through either bilingual staff who are competent in interpreting and who are present at the orientation or who are patched in by phone to act as interpreters. The department also has an agreement whereby some of its prisons house a small number of INS detainees. For those detainees or other inmates who are LEP and do not speak Haitian Creole or Spanish, the department has created a list of sources for interpretation, including department staff, contract interpreters, university resources, and a telephonic interpretation service. Each person receives at least an oral explanation of the rights, rules, and opportunities. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

**Example:** A department of corrections that receives Federal financial assistance determines that, even though the State in which it resides has a law declaring English the official language, it should still ensure that LEP prisoners understand the rules, rights, and opportunities and have meaningful access to important information and services at the State prisons. Despite the state’s official English law, the Title VI regulations apply to the department of corrections.

c. Disciplinary Action
When a prisoner who is LEP is the subject of disciplinary action, the prison, where appropriate, should provide language assistance. That assistance should ensure that the LEP prisoner had adequate notice of the rule in question and is meaningfully able to understand and participate in the process afforded prisoners under those circumstances. As noted previously, fellow inmates should generally not serve as interpreters in disciplinary hearings.

d. Health and Safety
Prisons providing health services should refer to the Department of Health and Human Services’ guidance regarding health care providers’ Title VI and Title VI regulatory obligations, as well as with this Guidance.

Health care services are obviously extremely important. How access to those services is provided depends upon the four-factor analysis. If, for instance, a prison serves a high proportion of LEP individuals who speak Spanish, then the prison health care provider should likely have available qualified bilingual medical staff or interpreters versed in medical terms. If the population of LEP individuals is low, then the prison may choose instead, for example, to rely on a local community volunteer program that provides qualified interpreters through a university. Due to the private nature of medical situations, only in unpredictable emergency situations or in non-emergency cases where the inmate has waived rights to a non-inmate interpreter would the use of other bilingual inmates be appropriate.

e. Participation Affecting Length of Sentence
If a prisoner’s LEP status makes him/her unable to participate in a particular program, such a failure to participate should not be used to adversely impact the length of stay or significantly affect the conditions of imprisonment. Prisons have options in how to apply this standard. For instance, prisons could: (1) Make the program accessible to the LEP inmate; (2) identify or develop substitute or alternative, language-accessible programs, or (3) waive the requirement.

**Example:** State law provides that otherwise eligible prisoners may receive early release if they take and pass an alcohol counseling program. Given the importance of early release, LEP prisoners should, where appropriate, be provided access to this prerequisite in some fashion. How that access is provided depends on the three factors other than importance. If, for example, there are many LEP prisoners speaking a particular language in the prison system, the class could be provided in that language for those inmates. If there were far fewer LEP prisoners speaking a particular language, the prison might still need to ensure access to this prerequisite because of the importance of early release opportunities. Options include, for example, use of bilingual teachers, contract interpreters, or community volunteers to interpret during the class, reliance on videos or written explanations in a language the inmate understands, and/or modification of the requirements of the class to meet the LEP individual’s ability to understand and communicate.

f. ESL Classes
States often mandate English-as-a-Second language (ESL) classes for LEP inmates. Nothing in this Guidance indicates how recipients should address such mandates. But recipients should not overlook the long term positive impacts of incorporating or offering ESL programs in parallel with language assistance services as
one possible strategy for ensuring meaningful access. ESL courses can serve as an important adjunct to a proper LEP plan in prisons because, as prisoners gain proficiency in English, fewer language services are needed. However, the fact that ESL classes are made available does not obviate the need to provide meaningful access for prisoners who are not yet English proficient.

g. Community Corrections

This guidance also applies to community corrections programs that receive, directly or indirectly, Federal financial assistance. For them, the most frequent contact with LEP individuals will be with an offender, a victim, or the family members of either, but may also include witnesses and community members in the area in which a crime was committed.

As with other recipient activities, community corrections programs should apply the four factors and determine areas where language services are most needed and reasonable. Important oral communications include, for example: interviews; explaining conditions of probation/release; developing case plans; setting up referrals for services; regular supervision contacts; outlining violations of probation/parole and recommendations; and making adjustments to the case plan. Competent oral language services for LEP persons are important for each of these types of communication. Recipients have great flexibility in determining how to provide those services.

Just as with all language services, it is important that language services be competent. Some knowledge of the legal system may be necessary in certain circumstances. For example, special attention should be given to the technical interpretation skills of interpreters used when obtaining information from an offender during pre-sentence and violation of probation/parole investigations or in other circumstances in which legal terms and the results of inaccuracies could impose an enormous burden on the LEP person.

In addition, just as with other recipients, corrections programs should identify vital written materials for probation and parole that should be translated when a significant number or proportion of LEP individuals that speak a particular language is encountered. Vital documents in this context could include, for instance: probation/parole department descriptions and grievance procedures, offender rights information, the pre-sentence/release investigation report, notices of alleged violations, sentencing/release orders, including conditions of parole, and victim impact statement questionnaires.

C. Other Types of Recipients

DOJ provides Federal financial assistance to many other types of entities and programs, including, for example, courts, juvenile justice programs, shelters for victims of domestic violence, and domestic violence prevention programs. The Title VI regulations and this Guidance apply to those entities. Examples involving some of those recipients follow:

1. Courts

Application of the four-factor analysis requires recipient courts to ensure that LEP parties and witnesses receive competent language services, consistent with the four-factor analysis. At a minimum, every effort should be taken to ensure competent interpretation for LEP individuals during all hearings, trials, and motions during which the LEP individual must and/or may be present. When a recipient court appoints an attorney to represent an LEP defendant, the court should ensure that either the attorney is proficient in the LEP person’s language or that a competent interpreter is provided during consultations between the attorney and the LEP person.

Many states have created or adopted certification procedures for court interpreters. This is one way for recipients to ensure competency of interpreters. Where certification is available, courts should consider carefully the qualifications of interpreters who are not certified. Courts will not, however, always be able to find a certified

---

5 As used in this appendix, the word “court” or “courts” includes administrative adjudicatory systems or administrative hearings administered or conducted by a recipient.
interpreter, particularly for less frequently encountered languages. In a courtroom or administrative hearing setting, the use of informal interpreters, such as family members, friends, and caretakers, would not be appropriate.

*Example:* A State court receiving DOJ Federal financial assistance has frequent contact with LEP individuals as parties and witnesses, but has experienced a shortage in certified interpreters in the range of languages encountered. State court officials work with training and testing consultants to broaden the number of certified interpreters available in the top several languages spoken by LEP individuals in the state. Because resources are scarce and the development of tests expensive, State court officials decide to partner with other states that have already established agreements to share proficiency tests and to develop new ones together. The State court officials also look to other existing State plans for examples of: codes of professional conduct for interpreters; mandatory orientation and basic training for interpreters; interpreter proficiency tests in Spanish and Vietnamese language interpretation; a written test in English for interpreters in all languages covering professional responsibility, basic legal term definitions, court procedures, etc. They are considering working with other states to expand testing certification programs in coming years to include several other most frequently encountered languages. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

Many individuals, while able to communicate in English to some extent, are still LEP insofar as ability to understand the terms and precise language of the courtroom. Courts should consider carefully whether a person will be able to understand and communicate effectively in the stressful role of a witness or party and in situations where knowledge of language subtleties and/or technical terms and concepts are involved or where key determinations are made based on credibility.

*Example:* Judges in a county court receiving Federal financial assistance have adopted a voir dire for determining a witness’ need for an interpreter. The voir dire avoids questions that could be answered with “yes” or “no.” It includes questions about comfort level in English, and questions that require active responses, such as: “How did you come to court today?” etc. The judges also ask the witness more complicated conceptual questions to determine the extent of the person’s proficiency in English. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

*Example:* A court encounters a domestic violence victim who is LEP. Even though the court is located in a State where English has been declared the official language, it employs a competent interpreter to ensure meaningful access. Despite the state’s official English law, the Title VI regulations apply to the court.

When courts experience low numbers or proportions of LEP individuals from a particular language group and infrequent contact with that language group, creation of a new certification test for interpreters may be overly burdensome. In such cases, other methods should be used to determine the competency of interpreters for the court’s purposes.

*Example:* A witness in a county court in a large city speaks Urdu and not English. The jurisdiction has no court interpreter certification testing for Urdu language interpreters because very few LEP individuals encountered speak Urdu and there is no such test available through other states or organizations. However, a non-certified interpreter is available and has been given the standard English-language test on court processes and interpreter ethics. The judge brings in a second, independent, bilingual Urdu-speaking person from a local university, and asks the prospective interpreter to interpret the judge’s conversation with the second individual. The judge then asks the second Urdu speaker a series of questions designed to determine whether the interpreter accurately interpreted their conversation. Given the infrequent contact, the low number and proportion of Urdu LEP individuals in the area, and the high cost of providing certification tests for Urdu interpreters, this “second check” solution may be one appropriate way of ensuring meaningful access to the LEP individual.

*Example:* In order to minimize the necessity of the type of intense judicial intervention on the issue of quality noted in the previous example, the court administrators in a jurisdiction, working closely with interpreter and translator associations, the bar, judges, and community groups, have developed and disseminated a stringent set of qualifications for court interpreters. The State has adopted a certification test in several languages. A questionnaire and qualifications process helps identify qualified interpreters even when certified interpreters are
not available to meet a particular language need. Thus, the court administrators create a pool from which judges
and attorneys can choose. A team of court personnel, judges, interpreters, and others have developed a recom-
mended interpreter oath and a set of frequently asked questions and answers regarding court interpreting that
have been provided to judges and clerks. The frequently asked questions include information regarding the use
of team interpreters, breaks, the types of interpreting (consecutive, simultaneous, summary, and sight transla-
tions) and the professional standards for use of each one, and suggested questions for determining whether an
LEP witness is effectively able to communicate through the interpreter. Information sessions on the use of
interpreters are provided for judges and clerks. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

Another key to successful use of interpreters in the courtroom is to ensure that everyone in the process
understands the role of the interpreter.

Example: Judges in a recipient court administer a standard oath to each interpreter and make a statement to the
jury that the role of the interpreter is to interpret, verbatim, the questions posed to the witness and the witness’
response. The jury should focus on the words, not the non-verbals, of the interpreter. The judges also clarify the
role of the interpreter to the witness and the attorneys. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.

Just as corrections recipients should take care to ensure that eligible LEP individuals have the opportunity to
reduce the term of their sentence to the same extent that non-LEP individuals do, courts should ensure that LEP
persons have access to programs that would give them the equal opportunity to avoid serving a sentence at all.

Example: An LEP defendant should be given the same access to alternatives to sentencing, such as anger
management, batterers’ treatment and intervention, and alcohol abuse counseling, as is given to non-LEP
persons in the same circumstances.

Courts have significant contact with the public outside of the courtroom. Providing meaningful access to the legal
process for LEP individuals might require more than just providing interpreters in the courtroom. Recipient courts
should assess the need for language services all along the process, particularly in areas with high numbers of
unrepresented individuals, such as family, landlord-tenant, traffic, and small claims courts.

Example: Only twenty thousand people live in a rural county. The county superior court receives DOJ funds but
does not have a budget comparable to that of a more-populous urbanized county in the state. Over 1000 LEP
Hispanic immigrants have settled in the rural county. The urbanized county also has more than 1000 LEP His-
panic immigrants. Both counties have “how to” materials in English helping unrepresented individuals negotiate
the family court processes and providing information for

victims of domestic violence. The urban county has taken the lead in developing Spanish-language translations
of materials that would explain the process. The rural county modifies these slightly with the assistance of family
law and domestic violence advocates serving the Hispanic community, and thereby benefits from the work of the
urban county. Creative solutions, such as sharing resources across jurisdictions and working with local bar asso-
ciations and community groups, can help overcome serious financial concerns in areas with few resources.

There may be some instances in which the four-factor analysis of a particular portion of a recipient’s program
leads to the conclusion that language services are not currently required. For instance, the four-factor analysis
may not necessarily require that a purely voluntary tour of a ceremonial courtroom be given in languages other
than English by courtroom personnel, because the relative importance may not warrant such services given an
application of the other factors. However, a court may decide to provide such tours in languages other than
English given the demographics and the interest in the court. Because the analysis is fact-dependent, the same
conclusion may not be appropriate with respect to all tours.

Just as with police departments, courts and/or particular divisions within courts may have more contact with LEP
individuals than an assessment of the general population would indicate. Recipients should consider that higher
contact level when determining the number or proportion of LEP individuals in the contact population and the
frequency of such contact.
Example: A county has very few residents who are LEP. However, many Vietnamese-speaking LEP motorists go through a major freeway running through the county that connects two areas with high populations of Vietnamese speaking LEP individuals. As a result, the Traffic Division of the county court processes a large number of LEP persons, but it has taken no steps to train staff or provide forms or other language access in that Division because of the small number of LEP individuals in the county. The Division should assess the number and proportion of LEP individuals processed by the Division and the frequency of such contact. With those numbers high, the Traffic Division may find that it needs to provide key forms or instructions in Vietnamese. It may also find, from talking with community groups, that many older Vietnamese LEP individuals do not read Vietnamese well, and that it should provide oral language services as well. The court may already have Vietnamese-speaking staff competent in interpreting in a different section of the court; it may decide to hire a Vietnamese-speaking employee who is competent in the skill of interpreting; or it may decide that a telephonic interpretation service suffices.

2. Juvenile Justice Programs

DOJ provides funds to many juvenile justice programs to which this Guidance applies. Recipients should consider LEP parents when minor children encounter the legal system. Absent an emergency, recipients are strongly discouraged from using children as interpreters for LEP parents.

Example: A county coordinator for an anti-gang program operated by a DOJ recipient has noticed that increasing numbers of gangs have formed comprised primarily of LEP individuals speaking a particular foreign language. The coordinator may choose to assess the number of LEP youths at risk of involvement in these gangs, so that she can determine whether the program should hire a counselor who is bilingual in the particular language and English, or provide other types of language services to the LEP youths. When applying the four factors, recipients encountering juveniles should take into account that certain programs or activities may be even more critical and difficult to access for juveniles than they would be for adults. For instance, although an adult detainee may need some language services to access family members, a juvenile being detained on immigration-related charges who is held by a recipient may need more language services in order to have access to his or her parents.

3. Domestic Violence Prevention/Treatment Programs

Several domestic violence prevention and treatment programs receive DOJ financial assistance and thus must apply this Guidance to their programs and activities. As with all other recipients, the mix of services needed should be determined after conducting the four-factor analysis. For instance, a shelter for victims of domestic violence serving a largely Hispanic area in which many people are LEP should strongly consider accessing qualified bilingual counselors, staff, and volunteers, whereas a shelter that has experienced almost no encounters with LEP persons and serves an area with very few LEP persons may only reasonably need access to a telephonic interpretation service. Experience, program modifications, and demographic changes may require modifications to the mix over time.

Example: A shelter for victims of domestic violence is operated by a recipient of DOJ funds and located in an area where 15 percent of the women in the service area speak Spanish and are LEP. Seven percent of the women in the service area speak various Chinese dialects and are LEP. The shelter uses competent community volunteers to help translate vital outreach materials into Chinese (which is one written language despite many dialects) and Spanish. The shelter hotline has a menu providing key information, such as location, in English, Spanish, and two of the most common Chinese dialects. Calls for immediate assistance are handled by the bilingual staff. The shelter has one counselor and several volunteers fluent in Spanish and English. Some volunteers are fluent in different Chinese dialects and in English. The shelter works with community groups to access interpreters in the several Chinese dialects that they encounter. Shelter staff train the community volunteers in the sensitivities of domestic violence intake and counseling. Volunteers sign confidentiality agreements. The shelter is looking for a grant to increase its language capabilities despite its tiny budget. These actions constitute strong evidence of compliance.
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Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

§2000d Prohibition against exclusion from participation in, denial of benefits of, and discrimination under federally assisted programs on ground of race, color or national origin

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

§2000d-1. Federal authority and financial assistance to programs or activities by way of grant, loan, or contract other than contract of insurance or guaranty; rules and regulations; approval by President; compliance with requirements; reports to Congressional committees; effective date of administrative action

Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with assistance in connection with which the action is taken. No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President. Compliance with any requirement adopted pursuant to this section may be effected (1) by the termination of or refusal to grant or to continue assistance under such program or activity to any recipient as to whom there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure to comply with such requirement, but such termination or refusal shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and, shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found, or (2) by any means authorized by law: Provided, however, That no such action shall be taken until the department or agency concerned has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with the requirement and had determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means. In the case of any action terminating, or refusing to grant or continue, assistance because of failure to comply with a requirement imposed pursuant to this section, the head of the Federal department or agency shall file with the committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program or activity involved a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. No such action shall become effective until thirty days have elapsed after the filing of such report.

§2000d-2. Judicial review; administrative procedure provisions

Any department or agency action taken pursuant to section 602, shall be subject to such judicial review as may otherwise be provided by law for similar action taken by such department or agency on other grounds. In the case of action, not otherwise subject to judicial review, terminating or refusing to grant or to continue financial assistance upon a finding of failure to comply with any requirement imposed pursuant to section 602, any person aggrieved (including any State or political subdivision thereof and any agency of either) may obtain judicial review of such action in accordance with section 10 of the Administrative Procedures Act, and such action shall not be deemed committed to a non-reviewable agency discretion within the meaning of that section.
§2000d-3. Construction of provisions not to authorize administrative action with respect to employment practices except where primary objective of Federal financial assistance is to provide employment

Nothing contained in this subchapter shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

§2000d-4. Federal authority and financial assistance to programs or activities by way of contract of insurance or guarantee

Nothing in this subchapter shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

§2000d-4a. "Program or activity" and "program" defined

For the purposes of this subchapter, the term "program or activity" and the term "program" mean all of the operations of --

1. (A) a department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of a State or of a local government; or
   (B) the entity of such State or local government that distributes such assistance and each such department or agency (and each other State or local government entity) to which the assistance is extended, in the case of assistance to a State or local government;

2. (A) a college, university, or other postsecondary institution, or a public system of higher education; or
   (B) a local educational agency (as defined in section 198(a)(10) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), system of vocational education, or other school system;

3. (A) an entire corporation, partnership, or other private organization, or an entire sole proprietorship --
   (i) if assistance is extended to such corporation, partnership, private organization, or sole proprietorship as a whole; or
   (ii) which is principally engaged in the business of providing education, health care, housing, social services, or parks and recreation; or
   (B) the entire plant or other comparable, geographically separate facility to which Federal financial assistance is extended, in the case of any other corporation, partnership, private organization, or sole proprietorship; or

4. any other entity which is established by two or more of the entities described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3); any part of which is extended Federal financial assistance.

§2000d-5. Prohibited deferral of action on applications by local educational agencies seeking Federal funds for alleged noncompliance with Civil Rights Act

The Secretary of Education shall not defer action or order action deferred on any application by a local educational agency for funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 [20 U.S.C. 2701 et. seq.], by the Act of September 20, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) [20 U.S.C. 236 et seq.], by the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) [20 U.S.C. 631 et seq.], or by the Cooperative Research Act [20 U.S.C. 331 et seq.], on the basis of alleged noncompliance with the provisions of this subchapter for more than sixty days after notice is given to such local agency of such deferral unless such local agency is given the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 2000d-1 of this title, such hearing to be held within sixty days of such notice, unless the time for such hearing is extended by mutual consent of such local agency and the Secretary, and such deferral shall not continue for more than thirty days after the close of any such hearing unless there has been an express finding on the record of such hearing that such local educational agency has failed to comply with the provisions of this subchapter: Provided, That, for the purpose of determining whether a local educational agency is in compliance with this subchapter, compliance by such agency with a final order or judgment of a Federal court for the desegregation of the school or school system operated by such agency shall be deemed to be compliance with this subchapter, insofar as the matters covered in the order or judgment are concerned.
§ 2000d-6. Policy of United States as to application of nondiscrimination provisions in schools of local educational agencies

(a) Declaration of uniform policy

It is the policy of the United States that guidelines and criteria established pursuant to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.] and section 182 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 [42 U.S.C. 2000d-5] dealing with conditions of segregation by race, whether de jure or de facto, in the schools of the local educational agencies of any State shall be applied uniformly in all regions of the United States whatever the origin or cause of such segregation.

(b) Nature of uniformity

Such uniformity refers to one policy applied uniformly to de jure segregation wherever found and such other policy as a may be provided pursuant to law applied uniformly to de facto segregation wherever found.

(c) Prohibition of construction for diminution of obligation for enforcement or compliance with nondiscrimination requirements

Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish the obligation of responsible officials to enforce or comply with such guidelines and criteria in order to eliminate discrimination in federally assisted programs and activities as required by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.]

(d) Additional funds

It is the sense of the Congress that the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Education should request such additional funds as may be necessary to apply the policy set forth in this section throughout the United States.

§ 2000d-7. Civil rights remedies equalization

(a) General provision


(2) In a suit against a State for a violation of a statute referred to in paragraph (1), remedies (including remedies both at law and in equity) are available for such a violation to the same extent as such remedies are available for such a violation in the suit against any public or private entity other than a State.

(b) Effective date

The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall take effect with respect to violations that occur in whole or in part after October 21, 1986.
Sec. 21.1 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to effectuate the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (hereafter referred to as the Act) to the end that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation.
Sec. 21.3 Application of this part.

(a) This part applies to any program for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under a law administered by the Department, including the types of Federal financial assistance listed in appendix A to this part. It also applies to money paid, property transferred, or other Federal financial assistance extended after the effective date of this part pursuant to an application approved before that effective date. This part does not apply to:

1. Any Federal financial assistance by way of insurance or guaranty contracts;
2. Money paid, property transferred, or other assistance extended before the effective date of this part, except where such assistance was subject to the title VI regulations of any agency whose responsibilities are now exercised by this Department;
3. Any assistance to any individual who is the ultimate beneficiary; or
4. Any employment practice, under any such program, of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization, except to the extent described in Sec. 21.5(c).

The fact that a type of Federal financial assistance is not listed in appendix A to this part shall not mean, if title VI of the Act is otherwise applicable, that a program is not covered. Other types of Federal financial assistance under statutes now in force or hereinafter enacted may be added to appendix A to this part.

(b) In any program receiving Federal financial assistance in the form, or for the acquisition, of real property or an interest in real property, to the extent that rights to space on, over, or under any such property are included as part of the program receiving that assistance, the nondiscrimination requirement of this part shall extend to any facility located wholly or in part in that space.

Sec. 21.5 Discrimination prohibited.

(a) General. No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under, any program to which this part applies.

(b) Specific discriminatory actions prohibited:

1. A recipient to which this part applies may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.
   (i) Deny a person any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
   (ii) Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit to a person which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;
   (iii) Subject a person to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;
   (iv) Restrict a person in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;
   (v) Treat a person differently from others in determining whether he satisfies any admission, enrollment, quota, eligibility, membership, or other requirement or condition which persons must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
   (vi) Deny a person an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program;
   (vii) Deny a person the opportunity to participate as a member of a planning, advisory, or similar body which is an integral part of the program.

2. A recipient, in determining the types of services, financial aid, or other benefits, or facilities which will be provided under any such program, or the class of person to whom, or the situations in which, such services, financial aid, other benefits, or facilities will be provided under any such program, or the class of persons to be afforded an opportunity to participate in any such program; may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of
subjecting persons to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of
defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program with respect to
individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

(3) In determining the site or location of facilities, a recipient or applicant may not make selections with
the purpose or effect of excluding persons from, denying them the benefits of, or subjecting them to
discrimination under any program to which this regulation applies, on the grounds of race, color, or
national origin; or with the purpose or effect of defeating or substantially impairing the accomplishment
of the objectives of the Act or this part.

(4) As used in this section the services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program
receiving Federal financial assistance include any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided in or
through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance.

(5) The enumeration of specific forms of prohibited discrimination in this paragraph does not limit the
generality of the prohibition in paragraph (a) of this section.

(6) Examples demonstrating the application of the provisions of this section to certain types of Federal
financial assistance administered by the Department of Transportation are contained in appendix C of
this part.

(7) This part does not prohibit the consideration of race, color, or national origin if the purpose and effect
are to remove or overcome the consequences of practices or impediments which have restricted the
availability of, or participation in, the program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, on the
grounds of race, color, or national origin. Where prior discriminatory practice or usage tends, on the
grounds of race, color, or national origin to exclude individuals from participation in, to deny them the
benefits of, or to subject them to discrimination under any program or activity to which this part applies,
the applicant or recipient must take affirmative action to remove or overcome the effects of the prior
discriminatory practice or usage. Even in the absence of prior discriminatory practice or usage, a recipi-
ent in administering a program or activity to which this part applies, is expected to take affirmative ac-
tion to assure that no person is excluded from participation in or denied the benefits of the program or
activity on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

(c) Employment practices:

(1) Where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance to a program to which this part applies
is to provide employment, a recipient or other party subject to this part shall not, directly or through
contractual or other arrangements, subject a person to discrimination on the ground of race, color, or
national origin in its employment practices under such program (including recruitment or recruitment
advertising, hiring, firing, upgrading, promotion, demotion, transfer, layoff, termination, rates of pay or
other forms of compensation or benefits, selection for training or apprenticeship, use of facilities, and
treatment of employees). Such recipient shall take affirmative action to insure that applicants are em-
ployed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, or national
origin. The requirements applicable to construction employment under any such program shall be those
specified in or pursuant to Part III of Executive Order 11246 or any Executive order which supersedes
it.

(2) Federal financial assistance to programs under laws funded or administered by the Department which
have as a primary objective the providing of employment include those set forth in appendix B to this
part.

(3) Where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is not to provide employment, but dis-
crimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in the employment practices of the recipient
or other persons subject to the regulation tends, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, to ex-
clude individuals from participation in, to deny them the benefits of, or to subject them to discrimination
under any program to which this regulation applies, the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section
shall apply to the employment practices of the recipient or other persons subject to the regulation, to
the extent necessary to assure equality of opportunity to, and nondiscriminatory treatment of, benefi-
ciaries.

(d) A recipient may not make a selection of a site or location of a facility if the purpose of that selection, or
its effect when made, is to exclude individuals from participation in, to deny them the benefits of, or to
subject them to discrimination under any program or activity to which this rule applies, on the grounds of
race, color, or national origin; or if the purpose is to, or its effect when made will, substantially impair the
accomplishment of the objectives of this part.
Sec. 21.7 Assurances required.

(a) General.

(1) Every application for Federal financial assistance to which this part applies, except an application to which paragraph (b) of this section applies, and every application for Federal financial assistance to provide a facility shall, as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application, contain or be accompanied by, an assurance that the program will be conducted or the facility operated in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part. Every award of Federal financial assistance shall require the submission of such an assurance. In the case where the Federal financial assistance is to provide or is in the form of personal property, or real property or interest therein or structures thereon, the assurance shall obligate the recipient, or, in the case of a subsequent transfer, the transferee, for the period during which the property is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits, or for as long as the recipient retains ownership or possession of the property, whichever is longer. In all other cases the assurance shall obligate the recipient for the period during which Federal financial assistance is extended to the program. The Secretary shall specify the form of the foregoing assurances, and the extent to which like assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors and subcontractors, transferees, successors in interest, and other participants. Any such assurance shall include provisions which give the United States a right to seek its judicial enforcement.

(2) In the case where Federal financial assistance is provided in the form of a transfer of real property, structures, or improvements thereon, or interest therein, from the Federal Government, the instrument effecting or recording the transfer shall contain a covenant running with the land assuring nondiscrimination for the period during which the real property is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits. Where no transfer of property or interest therein from the Federal Government is involved, but property is acquired or improved with Federal financial assistance, the recipient shall agree to include such covenant in any subsequent transfer of such property. When the property is obtained from the Federal Government, such covenant may also include a condition coupled with a right to be reserved by the Department to revert title to the property in the event of a breach of the covenant where, in the discretion of the Secretary, such a condition and right of reverter is appropriate to the statute under which the real property is obtained and to the nature of the grant and the grantee. In such event if a transferee of real property proposes to mortgage or otherwise encumber the real property as security for financing construction of new, or improvement of existing, facilities on such property for the purposes for which the property was transferred, the Secretary may agree, upon request of the transferee and if necessary to accomplish such financing, and upon such conditions as he deems appropriate, to subordinate such right of reversion to the lien of such mortgage or other encumbrance.

(b) Continuing Federal financial assistance. Every application by a State or a State agency for continuing Federal financial assistance to which this part applies (including the types of Federal financial assistance listed in appendix A to this part) shall as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application:

(1) Contain or be accompanied by a statement that the program is (or, in the case of a new program, will be) conducted in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part, and

(2) provide or be accompanied by provision for such methods of administration for the program as are found by the Secretary to give reasonable guarantee that the applicant and all recipients of Federal financial assistance under such program will comply with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part.
Sec. 21.9 Compliance information.

(a) Cooperation and assistance. The Secretary shall to the fullest extent practicable seek the cooperation of recipients in obtaining compliance with this part and shall provide assistance and guidance to recipients to help them comply voluntarily with this part.

(b) Compliance reports. Each recipient shall keep such records and submit to the Secretary timely, complete, and accurate compliance reports at such times, and in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to enable him to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying with this part. In the case in which a primary recipient extends Federal financial assistance to any other recipient, such other recipient shall also submit such compliance reports to the primary recipient as may be necessary to enable the primary recipient to carry out its obligations under this part. In general recipients should have available for the Secretary racial and ethnic data showing the extent to which members of minority groups are beneficiaries of programs receiving Federal financial assistance.

(c) Access to sources of information. Each recipient shall permit access by the Secretary during normal business hours to such of its books, records, accounts, and other sources of information, and its facilities as may be pertinent to ascertain compliance with this part. Where any information required of a recipient is in the exclusive possession of any other agency, institution, or person and this agency, institution, or person fails or refuses to furnish this information, the recipient shall so certify in its report and shall set forth what efforts it has made to obtain the information.

(d) Information to beneficiaries and participants. Each recipient shall make available to participants, beneficiaries, and other interested persons such information regarding the provisions of this part and its applicability to the program for which the recipient receives Federal financial assistance, and make such information available to them in such manner, as the Secretary finds necessary to apprise such persons of the protections against discrimination assured them by the Act and this part.

Sec. 21.11 Conduct of investigations.

(a) Periodic compliance reviews. The Secretary shall from time to time review the practices of recipients to determine whether they are complying with this part.

(b) Complaints. Any person who believes himself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by this part may by himself or by a representative file with the Secretary a written complaint. A complaint must be filed not later than 180 days after the date of the alleged discrimination, unless the time for filing is extended by the Secretary.

(c) Investigations. The Secretary will make a prompt investigation whenever a compliance review, report, complaint, or any other information indicates a possible failure to comply with this part. The investigation will include, where appropriate, a review of the pertinent practices and policies of the recipient, the circumstances under which the possible noncompliance with this part occurred, and other factors relevant to a determination as to whether the recipient has failed to comply with this part.

(d) Resolution of matters.

(1) If an investigation pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section indicates a failure to comply with this part, the Secretary will so inform the recipient and the matter will be resolved by informal means whenever possible. If it has been determined that the matter cannot be resolved by informal means, action will be taken as provided for in Sec. 21.13.

(2) If an investigation does not warrant action pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) of this section the Secretary will so inform the recipient and the complainant, if any, in writing.
(e) Intimidatory or retaliatory acts prohibited. No recipient or other person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or discriminate against any individual for the purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by section 601 of the Act or this part, or because he has made a complaint, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this part. The identity of complainants shall be kept confidential except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, including the conduct of any investigation, hearing, or judicial proceeding arising thereunder.

Sec. 21.13 Procedure for effecting compliance.

(a) General. If there appears to be a failure or threatened failure to comply with this part, and if the noncompliance or threatened noncompliance cannot be corrected by informal means, compliance with this part may be effected by the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance or by any other means authorized by law. Such other means may include, but are not limited to:

(1) A reference to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce any rights of the United States under any law of the United States (including other titles of the Act), or any assurance or other contractual undertaking, and (2) any applicable proceeding under State or local law.

(b) Noncompliance with Sec. 21.7. If an applicant fails or refuses to furnish an assurance required under Sec. 21.7 or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to that section, Federal financial assistance may be refused in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (c) of this section. The Department shall not be required to provide assistance in such a case during the pendency of the administrative proceedings under such paragraph. However, subject to Sec. 21.21, the Department shall continue assistance during the pendency of such proceedings where such assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application approved prior to the effective date of this part.

(c) Termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance. No order suspending, terminating, or refusing to grant or continue Federal financial assistance shall become effective until:

(1) The Secretary has advised the applicant or recipient of his failure to comply and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means;
(2) There has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure by the applicant or recipient to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to this part;
(3) The action has been approved by the Secretary pursuant to Sec. 21.17(e); and
(4) The expiration of 30 days after the Secretary has filed with the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program involved, a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action.

Any action to suspend or terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other applicant or recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.

(d) Other means authorized by law. No action to effect compliance with title VI of the Act by any other means authorized by law shall be taken by this Department until:

(1) The Secretary has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means;
(2) The recipient or other person has been notified of its failure to comply and of the action to be taken to effect compliance; and
(3) The expiration of at least 10 days from the mailing of such notice to the recipient or other person. During this period of at least 10 days, additional efforts shall be made to persuade the recipient or other person to comply with the regulation and to take such corrective action as may be appropriate.
Sec. 21.15 Hearings.

(a) Opportunity for hearing. Whenever an opportunity for a hearing is required by Sec. 21.13(c), reasonable notice shall be given by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the affected applicant or recipient. This notice shall advise the applicant or recipient of the action proposed to be taken, the specific provision under which the proposed action against it is to be taken, and the matters of fact or law asserted as the basis for this action, and either: (1) Fix a date not less than 20 days after the date of such notice within which the applicant or recipient may request of the Secretary that the matter be scheduled for hearing or (2) advise the applicant or recipient that the matter in question has been set down for hearing at a stated place and time. The time and place so fixed shall be reasonable and shall be subject to change for cause. The complainant, if any, shall be advised of the time and place of the hearing. An applicant or recipient may waive a hearing and submit written information and argument for the record.

The failure of an applicant or recipient to request a hearing under this paragraph or to appear at a hearing for which a date has been set shall be deemed to be a waiver of the right to a hearing under section 602 of the Act and Sec. 21.13(c) and consent to the making of a decision on the basis of such information as is available.

(b) Time and place of hearing. Hearings shall be held at the offices of the Department in Washington, D.C., at a time fixed by the Secretary unless he determines that the convenience of the applicant or recipient or of the Department requires that another place be selected. Hearings shall be held before the Secretary, or at his discretion, before a hearing examiner appointed in accordance with section 3105 of title 5, United States Code, or detailed under section 3344 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) Right to counsel. In all proceedings under this section, the applicant or recipient and the Department shall have the right to be represented by counsel.

(d) Procedures, evidence, and record.
   (1) The hearing, decision, and any administrative review thereof shall be conducted in conformity with sections 554 through 557 of title 5, United States Code, and in accordance with such rules of procedure as are proper (and not inconsistent with this section) relating to the conduct of the hearing, giving of notices subsequent to those provided for in paragraph (a) of this section, taking of testimony, exhibits, arguments and briefs, requests for findings, and other related matters. Both the Department and the applicant or recipient shall be entitled to introduce all relevant evidence on the issues as stated in the notice for hearing or as determined by the officer conducting the hearing at the outset of or during the hearing.
   (2) Technical rules of evidence do not apply to hearings conducted pursuant to this part, but rules or principles designed to assure production of the most credible evidence available and to subject testimony to test by cross-examination shall be applied where reasonably necessary by the officer conducting the hearing. The hearing officer may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence. All documents and other evidence offered or taken for the record shall be open to examination by the parties and opportunity shall be given to refute facts and arguments advanced on either side of the issues. A transcript shall be made of the oral evidence except to the extent the substance thereof is stipulated for the record. All decisions shall be based upon the hearing record and written findings shall be made.

(e) Consolidated or joint hearings. In cases in which the same or related facts are asserted to constitute noncompliance with this part with respect to two or more Federal statutes, authorities, or other means by which Federal financial assistance is extended and to which this part applies, or noncompliance with this part and the regulations of one or more other Federal departments or agencies issued under title VI of the Act, the Secretary may, by agreement with such other departments or agencies, where applicable, provide for the conduct of consolidated or joint hearings, and for the application to such hearings of rules or procedures not inconsistent with this part. Final decisions in such cases, insofar as this regulation is concerned, shall be made in accordance with Sec. 21.17.
Sec. 21.17 Decisions and notices.

(a) Procedure on decisions by hearing examiner. If the hearing is held by a hearing examiner, the hearing examiner shall either make an initial decision, if so authorized, or certify the entire record including his recommended findings and proposed decision to the Secretary for a final decision, and a copy of such initial decision or certification shall be mailed to the applicant or recipient. Where the initial decision is made by the hearing examiner the applicant or recipient may, within 30 days after the mailing of such notice of initial decision, file with the Secretary his exceptions to the initial decision, with his reasons therefor. In the absence of exceptions, the Secretary may, on his own motion, within 45 days after the initial decision, serve on the applicant or recipient a notice that he will review the decision. Upon the filing of such exceptions or of notice of review, the Secretary shall review the initial decision and issue his own decision thereon including the reasons therefor. In the absence of either exceptions or a notice of review the initial decision shall, subject to paragraph (e) of this section, constitute the final decision of the Secretary.

(b) Decisions on record or review by the Secretary. Whenever a record is certified to the Secretary for decision or he reviews the decision of a hearing examiner pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, or whenever the Secretary conducts the hearing, the applicant or recipient shall be given reasonable opportunity to file with him briefs or other written statements of its contentions, and a written copy of the final decision of the Secretary shall be sent to the applicant or recipient and to the complainant, if any.

(c) Decisions on record where a hearing is waived. Whenever a hearing is waived pursuant to Sec. 21.15, a decision shall be made by the Secretary on the record and a written copy of such decision shall be sent to the applicant or recipient, and to the complainant, if any.

(d) Rulings required. Each decision of a hearing examiner or the Secretary shall set forth his ruling on each finding, conclusion, or exception presented, and shall identify the requirement or requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part with which it is found that the applicant or recipient has failed to comply.

(e) Approval by Secretary. Any final decision by an official of the Department, other than the Secretary personally, which provides for the suspension or termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, or the imposition of any other sanction available under this part or the Act, shall promptly be transmitted to the Secretary personally, who may approve such decision, may vacate it, or remit or mitigate any sanction imposed.

(f) Content of orders. The final decision may provide for suspension or termination of, or refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, in whole or in part, to which this regulation applies, and may contain such terms, conditions, and other provisions as are consistent with and will effectuate the purposes of the Act and this part, including provisions designed to assure that no Federal financial assistance to which this regulation applies will thereafter be extended to the applicant or recipient determined by such decision to be in default in its performance of an assurance given by it pursuant to this part, or to have otherwise failed to comply with this part, unless and until it corrects its noncompliance and satisfies the Secretary that it will fully comply with this part.

(g) Post termination proceedings.

(1) An applicant or recipient adversely affected by an order issued under paragraph (f) of this section shall be restored to full eligibility to receive Federal financial assistance if it satisfies the terms and conditions of that order for such eligibility or if it brings itself into compliance with this part and provides reasonable assurance that it will fully comply with this part.

(2) Any applicant or recipient adversely affected by an order entered pursuant to paragraph (f) of this section may at any time request the Secretary to restore fully its eligibility to receive Federal financial assistance. Any such request shall be supported by information showing that the applicant or recipient has met the requirements of paragraph (g)(1) of this section. If the Secretary determines that those requirements have been satisfied, he shall restore such eligibility.
(1) If the Secretary denies any such request, the applicant or recipient may submit a request for a hearing in writing, specifying who it believes such official to have been in error. It shall thereupon be given an expeditious hearing, with a decision on the record in accordance with rules or procedures issued by the Secretary. The applicant or recipient will be restored to such eligibility if it proves at such a hearing that it satisfied the requirements of paragraph (g)(1) of this section.

While proceedings under this paragraph are pending, the sanctions imposed by the order issued under paragraph (f) of this section shall remain in effect.

Sec. 21.19 Judicial review.

Action taken pursuant to section 602 of the Act is subject to judicial review as provided in section 603 of the Act.

Sec. 21.21 Effect on other regulations, forms, and instructions.

(a) Effect on other regulations. All regulations, orders, or like directions issued before the effective date of this part by any officer of the Department which impose requirements designed to prohibit any discrimination against individuals on the grounds of race, color, or national origin under any program to which this part applies, and which authorize the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance to any applicant for a recipient of such assistance for failure to comply with such requirements, are hereby superseded to the extent that such discrimination is prohibited by this part, except that nothing in this part may be considered to relieve any person of any obligation assumed or imposed under any such superseded regulation, order, instruction, or like direction before the effective date of this part. Nothing in this part, however, supersedes any of the following (including future amendments thereof):

(1) Executive Order 11246 (3 CFR, 1965 Supp., p. 167) and regulations issued thereunder or
(2) any other orders, regulations, or instructions, insofar as such orders, regulations, or instructions prohibit discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin in any program or situation to which this part is inapplicable, or prohibit discrimination on any other ground.

(b) Forms and instructions. The Secretary shall issue and promptly make available to all interested persons forms and detailed instructions and procedures for effectuating this part as applied to programs to which this part applies and for which he is responsible.

(c) Supervision and coordination. The Secretary may from time to time assign to officials of the Department, or to officials of other departments or agencies of the Government with the consent of such departments or agencies, responsibilities in connection with the effectuation of the purposes of title VI of the Act and this part (other than responsibility on of title VI and this part to similar programs and in similar situations. Any action taken, determination made or requirement imposed by an official of another department or agency acting pursuant to an assignment of responsibility under this paragraph shall have the same effect as though such action had been taken by the Secretary of this Department.

Sec. 21.23 Definitions.

Unless the context requires otherwise, as used in this part:
(a) Applicant means a person who submits an application, request, or plan required to be approved by the Secretary, or by a primary recipient, as a condition to eligibility for Federal financial assistance, and "application" means such an application, request, or plan.

(b) Facility includes all or any part of structures, equipment, or other real or personal property or interests therein, and the provision of facilities includes the construction, expansion, renovation, remodeling, alteration or acquisition of facilities.
Federal financial assistance includes:
1. Grants and loans of Federal funds
2. The grant or donation of Federal property and interests in property;
3. The detail of Federal personnel;
4. The sale and lease of, and the permission to use (on other than a casual or transient basis), Federal property or any interest in such property without consideration or at a nominal consideration, or at a consideration which is reduced for the purpose of assisting the recipient, or in recognition of the public interest to be served by such sale or lease to the recipient; and
5. Any Federal agreement, arrangement, or other contract which has as one of its purposes the provision of assistance.

Primary recipient means any recipient that is authorized or required to extend Federal financial assistance to another recipient.

Program or activity and program mean all of the operations of any entity described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (4) of this section, any part of which is extended Federal financial assistance:

1. (i) A department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of a State or of a local government; or
   (ii) The entity of such State or local government that distributes such assistance and each such department or agency (and each other State or local government entity) to which the assistance is extended, in the case of assistance to a State or local government;
2. (i) A college, university, or other postsecondary institution, or a public system of higher education; or
   (ii) A local educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 7801), system of vocational education, or other school system;
3. (i) An entire corporation, partnership, or other private organization, or an entire sole proprietorship—
   (A) If assistance is extended to such corporation, partnership, private organization, or sole proprietorship as a whole; or
   (B) Which is principally engaged in the business of providing education, health care, housing, social services, or parks and recreation; or
   (ii) The entire plant or other comparable, geographically separate facility to which Federal financial assistance is extended, in the case of any other corporation, partnership, private organization, or sole proprietorship; or
4. Any other entity which is established by two or more of the entities described in paragraph (e)(1), (2), or (3) of this section.

Recipient may mean any State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, or any political subdivision thereof, or instrumentality thereof, any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any individual, in any State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, to whom Federal financial assistance is extended, directly or through another recipient, including any successor, assignee, or transferee thereof, but such term does not include any ultimate beneficiary.

Secretary means the Secretary of Transportation or, except in Sec. 21.17 (e), any person to whom he has delegated his authority in the matter concerned.
Appendix A to Part 21--Activities to which This Part Applies

1. Use of grants made in connection with Federal-aid highway systems (23 U.S.C. 101 et seq.).
4. Lease of real property and the grant of permits, licenses, easements and rights-of-way covering real property under control of the Coast Guard (14 U.S.C. 93 (n) and (o)).
5. Utilization of Coast Guard personnel and facilities by any State, territory, possession, or political subdivision thereof (14 U.S.C. 141(a)).
7. Use of obsolete and other Coast Guard material by sea scout service of Boy Scouts of America, any incorporated unit of the Coast Guard auxiliary, and public body or private organization not organized for profit (14 U.S.C. 641(a)).
9. Use of grants for the support of basic scientific research by nonprofit institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is conduct of scientific research (42 U.S.C. 1891).
11. Use of U.S. land acquired for public airports under:
   a. Section 16 of the Federal Airport Act, 49 U.S.C. 1115; and
12. Activities carried out in connection with the Aviation Education Program of the Federal Aviation Administration under sections 305, 311, and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1346, 1352, and 1354(a)).
18. Use of grants made in connection with the High Speed Ground Transportation Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 631-642)
Appendix B to Part 21--Activities to Which This Part Applies When a Primary Objective of the Federal Financial Assistance Is To Provide Employment

1. Appalachia Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App. 1 et seq.).

Appendix C to Part 21--Application of Part 21 to Certain Federal Financial Assistance of the Department of Transportation

Nondiscrimination on Federally Assisted Projects

(a) Examples. The following examples, without being exhaustive, illustrate the application of the nondiscrimination provisions of this part on projects receiving Federal financial assistance under the programs of certain Department of Transportation operating administrations:

(1) Federal Aviation Administration.
   (i) The airport sponsor or any of his lessees, concessionaires, or contractors may not differentiate between members of the public because of race, color, or national origin in furnishing, or admitting to, waiting rooms, passenger holding areas, aircraft tiedown areas, restaurant facilities, restrooms, or facilities operated under the compatible land use concept.
   (ii) The airport sponsor and any of his lessees, concessionaires, or contractors must offer to all members of the public the same degree and type of service without regard to race, color, or national origin. This rule applies to fixed base operators, restaurants, snack bars, gift shops, ticket counters, baggage handlers, car rental agencies, limousines and taxis franchised by the airport sponsor, insurance underwriters, and other businesses catering to the public at the airport.
   (iii) An aircraft operator may not be required to park his aircraft at a location that is less protected, or less accessible from the terminal facilities, than locations offered to others, because of his race, color, or national origin.
   (iv) The pilot of an aircraft may not be required to help more extensively in fueling operations, and may not be offered less incidental service (such as windshield wiping), than other pilots, because of his race, color, or national origin.
   (v) No pilot or crewmember eligible for access to a pilot's lounge or to unofficial communication facilities such as a UNICOM frequency may be restricted in that access because of his race, color, or national origin.
   (vi) Access to facilities maintained at the airport by air carriers or commercial operators for holders of first-class transportation tickets or frequent users of the carrier's or operator's services may not be restricted on the basis of race, color, or national origin.
   (vii) Passengers and crewmembers seeking ground transportation from the airport may not be assigned to different vehicles, or delayed or embarrassed in assignment to vehicles, by the airport sponsor or his lessees, concessionaires, or contractors, because of race, color, or national origin.
   (viii) Where there are two or more sites having equal potential to serve the aeronautical needs of the area, the airport sponsor shall select the site least likely to adversely affect existing communities. Such site selection shall not be made on the basis of race, color, or national origin.
   (ix) Employment at obligated airports, including employment by tenants and concessionaires shall be available to all regardless of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. The sponsor shall coordinate his airport plan with his local transit authority and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to assure public transportation, convenient to the disadvantaged areas of nearby communities to enhance employment opportunities for the disadvantaged and minority population.
   (x) The sponsor shall assure that the minority business community in his area is advised of the opportunities offered by airport concessions, and that bids are solicited from such qualified minority firms, and awards made without regard to race, color, or national origin.

(2) Federal Highway Administration. (i) The State, acting through its highway department, may not discriminate in its selection and retention of contractors, including without limitation, those whose services are retained for, or incidental to, construction, planning, research, highway safety, engineering, property management, and fee contracts and other commitments with person for services and
expenses incidental to the acquisition of right-of-way. (ii) The State may not discriminate against eligible persons in making relocation payments and in providing relocation advisory assistance where relocation is necessitated by highway right-of-way acquisitions.

(iii) Federal-aid contractors may not discriminate in their selection and retention of first-tier subcontractors, and first-tier subcontractors may not discriminate in their selection and retention of second-tier subcontractors, who participate in Federal-aid highway construction, acquisition of right-of-way and related projects, including those who supply materials and lease equipment.

(iv) The State may not discriminate against the traveling public and business users of the federally assisted highway in their access to and use of the facilities and services provided for public accommodations (such as eating, sleeping, rest, recreation, and vehicle servicing) constructed on, over or under the right-of-way of such highways.

(v) Neither the State, any other persons subject to this part, nor its contractors and subcontractors may discriminate in their employment practices in connection with highway construction projects or other projects assisted by the Federal Highway Administration.

(vi) The State shall not locate or design a highway in such a manner as to require, on the basis of race, color, or national origin, the relocation of any persons.

(vii) The State shall not locate, design, or construct a highway in such a manner as to deny reasonable access to, and use thereof, to any persons on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(3) Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

(i) Any person who is, or seeks to be, a patron of any public vehicle which is operated as a part of, or in conjunction with, a project shall be given the same access, seating, and other treatment with regard to the use of such vehicle as other persons without regard to their race, color, or national origin.

(ii) No person who is, or seeks to be, an employee of the project sponsor or lessees, concessionaires, contractors, licensees, or any organization furnishing public transportation service as a part of, or in conjunction with, the project shall be treated less favorably than any other employee or applicant with regard to hiring, dismissal, advancement, wages, or any other conditions and benefits of employment, on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(iii) No person or group of persons shall be discriminated against with regard to the routing, scheduling, or quality of service of transportation service furnished as a part of the project on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Frequency of service, age and quality of vehicles assigned to routes, quality of stations serving different routes, and location of routes may not be determined on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(iv) The location of projects requiring land acquisition and the displacement of persons from their residences and businesses may not be determined on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(b) Obligations of the airport operator--

(1) Tenants, contractors, and concessionaires. Each airport operator shall require each tenant, contractor, and concessionaire who provides any activity, service, or facility at the airport under lease, contract with, or franchise from the airport, to covenant in a form specified by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, that he will comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of this part.

(2) Notification of beneficiaries. The airport operator shall: (i) Make a copy of this part available at his office for inspection during normal working hours by any person asking for it, and (ii) conspicuously display a sign, or signs, furnished by the FAA, in the main public area or areas of the airport, stating that discrimination based on race, color, or national origin is prohibited on the airport.

(3) Reports. Each airport owner subject to this part shall, within 15 days after he receives it, forward to the Area Manager of the FAA Area in which the airport is located a copy of each written complaint charging discrimination because of race, color, or national origin by any person subject to this part, together with a statement describing all actions taken to resolve the matter, and the results thereof. Each airport operator shall submit to the area manager of the FAA area in which the airport is located a report for the preceding year on the date and in a form prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administrator.
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Sec. 200.1 Purpose.
To provide guidelines for: (a) Implementing the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Title VI compliance program under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related civil rights laws and regulations, and (b) Conducting Title VI program compliance reviews relative to the Federal-aid highway program.

Sec. 200.3 Application of this part.
The provisions of this part are applicable to all elements of FHWA and provide requirements and guidelines for State highway agencies to implement the Title VI Program requirements. The related civil rights laws and regulations are listed under Sec. 200.5(p) of this part. Title VI requirements for 23 U.S.C. 402 will be covered under a joint FHWA/NHTSA agreement.

Sec. 200.5 Definitions.
The following definitions shall apply for the purpose of this part:
(a) Affirmative action. A good faith effort to eliminate past and present discrimination in all federally assisted programs, and to ensure future nondiscriminatory practices.

(b) Beneficiary. Any person or group of persons (other than States) entitled to receive benefits, directly or indirectly, from any federally assisted program, i.e., relocatees, impacted citizens, communities, etc.

(c) Citizen participation. An open process in which the rights of the community to be informed, to provide comments to the Government and to receive a response from the Government are met through a full opportunity to be involved and to express needs and goals.

(d) Compliance. That satisfactory condition existing when a recipient has effectively implemented all of the Title VI requirements or can demonstrate that every good faith effort toward achieving this end has been made.
(e) Deficiency status. The interim period during which the recipient State has been notified of deficiencies, has not voluntarily complied with Title VI Program guidelines, but has not been declared in noncompliance by the Secretary of Transportation.

(f) Discrimination. That act (or action) whether intentional or unintentional, through which a person in the United States, solely because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, has been otherwise subjected to unequal treatment under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Federal Highway Administration under title 23 U.S.C.

(g) Facility. Includes all, or any part of, structures, equipment or other real or personal property, or interests therein, and the provision of facilities includes the construction, expansion, renovation, remodeling, alternation or acquisition of facilities.

(h) Federal assistance. Includes:
   (1) Grants and loans of Federal funds,
   (2) The grant or donation of Federal property and interests in property,
   (3) The detail of Federal personnel,
   (4) The sale and lease of, and the permission to use (on other than a casual or transient basis), Federal property or any interest in such property without consideration or at a nominal consideration, or at a consideration which is reduced for the purpose of assisting the recipient, or in recognition of the public interest to be served by such sale or lease to the recipient, and
   (5) Any Federal agreement, arrangement, or other contract which has, as one of its purposes, the provision of assistance.

(i) Noncompliance. A recipient has failed to meet prescribed requirements and has shown an apparent lack of good faith effort in implementing all of the Title VI requirements.

(j) Persons. Where designation of persons by race, color, or national origin is required, the following designations ordinarily may be used: "White not of Hispanic origin", "Black not of Hispanic origin", "Hispanic", "Asian or Pacific Islander", "American Indian or Alaskan Native." Additional subcategories based on national origin or primary language spoken may be used, where appropriate, on either a national or a regional basis.

(k) Program. Includes any highway, project, or activity for the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to individuals. This includes education or training, work opportunities, health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or other services, whether provided directly by the recipient of Federal financial assistance or provided by others through contracts or other arrangements with the recipient.

(l) State highway agency. That department, commission, board, or official of any State charged by its laws with the responsibility for highway construction. The term State would be considered equivalent to State highway agency if the context so implies.

(m) Program area officials. The officials in FHWA who are responsible for carrying out technical program responsibilities.

(n) Recipient. Any State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or any political subdivision, or instrumentality thereof, or any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any individual, in any State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, to whom Federal assistance is extended, either directly or through another recipient, for any program. Recipient includes any successor, assignee, or transferee thereof. The term recipient does not include any ultimate beneficiary under any such program.

(o) Secretary. The Secretary of Transportation as set forth in 49 CFR 21.17(g)(3) or the Federal Highway Administrator to whom the Secretary has delegated his authority in specific cases.
Title VI Program. The system of requirements developed to implement Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. References in this part to Title VI requirements and regulations shall not be limited to only Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Where appropriate, this term also refers to the civil rights provisions of other Federal statutes to the extent that they prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in programs receiving Federal financial assistance of the type subject to Title VI itself. These Federal statutes are:

1. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d-d4 (49 CFR part 21; the standard DOT Title VI assurances signed by each State pursuant to DOT Order 1050.2; Executive Order 11764; 28 CFR 50.3);
3. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, amended 1974 (42 U.S.C. 3601-3619);
4. 23 U.S.C. 109(h);
5. 23 U.S.C. 324;

Sec. 200.7 FHWA Title VI policy.

It is the policy of the FHWA to ensure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; 49 CFR part 21; and related statutes and regulations.

Sec. 200.9 State highway agency responsibilities.

(a) State assurances in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

1. Title 49, CFR part 21 (Department of Transportation Regulations for the implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) requires assurances from States that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the recipient receives Federal assistance from the Department of Transportation, including the Federal Highway Administration.

2. Section 162a of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 (section 324, title 23 U.S.C.) requires that there be no discrimination on the ground of sex. The FHWA considers all assurances heretofore received to have been amended to include a prohibition against discrimination on the ground of sex. These assurances were signed by the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. The State highway agency shall submit a certification to the FHWA indicating that the requirements of section 162a of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 have been added to its assurances.

3. The State highway agency shall take affirmative action to correct any deficiencies found by the FHWA within a reasonable time period, not to exceed 90 days, in order to implement Title VI compliance in accordance with State-signed assurances and required guidelines. The head of the State highway agency shall be held responsible for implementing Title VI requirements.

4. The State program area officials and Title VI Specialist shall conduct annual reviews of all pertinent program areas to determine the effectiveness of program area activities at all levels.

(b) State actions.

1. Establish a civil rights unit and designate a coordinator who has a responsible position in the organization and easy access to the head of the State highway agency. This unit shall contain a Title VI Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator or a Title VI Specialist, who shall be responsible for initiating and monitoring Title VI activities and preparing required reports.

2. Adequately staff the civil rights unit to effectively implement the State civil rights requirements.

3. Develop procedures for prompt processing and disposition of Title VI and Title VIII complaints received directly by the State and not by FHWA. Complaints shall be investigated by State civil rights personnel trained in compliance investigations. Identify each complainant by race, color, sex, or national origin; the recipient; the nature of the complaint; the dates the complaint was filed and the investigation completed; the disposition; the date of the disposition; and other pertinent information. Each recipient (State) processing Title VI complaints shall be required to maintain a similar log. A copy of the complaint, together with a copy of the State's report of investigation, shall be forwarded to the FHWA division office within 60 days of the date the complaint was received by the State.
Develop procedures for the collection of statistical data (race, color, religion, sex, and national origin) of participants in, and beneficiaries of State highway programs, i.e., relocatees, impacted citizens and affected communities.

Develop a program to conduct Title VI reviews of program areas.

Conduct annual reviews of special emphasis program areas to determine the effectiveness or program area activities at all levels.

Conduct Title VI reviews of cities, counties, consultant contractors, suppliers, universities, colleges, planning agencies, and other recipients of Federal-aid highway funds.

Review State program directives in coordination with State program officials and, where applicable, include Title VI and related requirements.

The State highway agency Title VI designee shall be responsible for conducting training programs on Title VI and related statutes for State program and civil rights officials.

Prepare a yearly report of Title VI accomplishments for the past year and goals for the next year.

Beginning October 1, 1976, each State highway agency shall annually submit an updated Title VI implementing plan to the Regional Federal Highway Administrator for approval or disapproval.

Develop Title VI information for dissemination to the general public and, where appropriate, in languages other than English.

Establishing procedures for pre-grant and post-grant approval reviews of State programs and applicants for compliance with Title VI requirements; i.e., highway location, design and relocation, and persons seeking contracts with the State.

Establish procedures to identify and eliminate discrimination when found to exist.

Establishing procedures for promptly resolving deficiency status and reducing to writing the remedial action agreed to be necessary, all within a period not to exceed 90 days.

Sec. 200.11 Procedures for processing Title VI reviews.

(a) If the regional Title VI review report contains deficiencies and recommended actions, the report shall be forwarded by the Regional Federal Highway Administrator to the Division Administrator, who will forward it with a cover letter to the State highway agency for corrective action.

(b) The division office, in coordination with the Regional Civil Rights Officer, shall schedule a meeting with the recipient, to be held not later than 30 days from receipt of the deficiency report.

(c) Recipients placed in a deficiency status shall be given a reasonable time, not to exceed 90 days after receipt of the deficiency letter, to voluntarily correct deficiencies.

(d) The Division Administrator shall seek the cooperation of the recipient in correcting deficiencies found during the review. The FHWA officials shall also provide the technical assistance and guidance needed to aid the recipient to comply voluntarily.

(e) When a recipient fails or refuses to voluntarily comply with requirements within the time frame allotted, the Division Administrator shall submit to the Regional Administrator two copies of the case file and a recommendation that the State be found in noncompliance.

(f) The Office of Civil Rights shall review the case file for a determination of concurrence or non-concurrence with a recommendation to the Federal Highway Administrator. Should the Federal Highway Administrator concur with the recommendation, the file is referred to the Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, for appropriate action in accordance with 49 CFR.
STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY (STA) RESPONSIBILITIES:

A. GENERAL

**Question 1:** Does the STA receive Federal financial assistance by means of grants, cooperative agreements, training, use of equipment, donations of surplus property, or other assistance? (Note: Sub-recipients are covered when Federal funds are passed through from one recipient to a sub-recipient.)

**Answer:** Federal financial assistance includes, but is not limited to, grants and loans of Federal funds; a grant or donation of Federal property and interests in property; the sale and lease of, and the permission to use Federal property; training; details of Federal personnel; or any agreement, arrangement, or other contract which has as one of its purposes the provision of assistance. Sub-recipients are also covered, when Federal funds are passed from one recipient to a sub-recipient. Recipients of Federal funds range from State and local agencies to non-profits and other organizations.

Recipients of U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) assistance include, but are not limited to: State departments of transportation; State motor vehicle administrations; airport operators; State highway safety programs; metropolitan planning organizations; regional transportation agencies; regional, state, and local transit operators; public safety agencies; hazardous materials transporters and other first responders; and State and local agencies with emergency transportation responsibilities. Entities covered by Title VI and the Executive Order are referenced in DOT’s Limited English Proficient (LEP) Guidance page 74091.

A list of 30 Federal agencies that provide Federal financial assistance and the types of entities that they fund can be found at: [www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/federalfundingsources.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/federalfundingsources.htm).

**Question 2:** Does the STA understand its responsibilities and obligations to LEP persons pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing DOT’s Title VI regulations to ensure LEP persons are not subject to discrimination?

**Answer:** Executive Order 13166 (E.O. 13166) is directed at implementing the obligations imposed by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI Federal regulations. Title VI and its accompanying regulation prohibit recipients from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Discrimination on the basis of national origin may occur if a recipient does not provide appropriate language assistance to LEP individuals, because these individuals, whose language is usually tied to their national origin, will not have access to the same benefits, services, and information or rights that the recipient provided to everyone else. The steps that agencies and federally funded entities must take to ensure compliance with Title VI may vary depending upon the service they offer, the community they serve, and their resources. There are no hard-and-fast rules. What might make sense for a large entity may not make sense for a smaller entity.

Both Federal agencies and recipients of Federal financial assistance must take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to their programs and activities to LEP individuals.

*Questions addressed in this document are the same questions from the Technical Assistance Tool.*
Question 3: Does the STA know what part of its programs are covered by Title VI to ensure reasonable steps are taken to provide meaningful access to LEP persons?

Answer: Title VI covers a recipient's entire program or activity. This means all of a recipient's operations are covered. This is true even if only one part of the recipient's operation receives the Federal assistance.

Question 4: Does the STA know or understand who is an LEP individual?

Answer: Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English can be limited English proficient, or "LEP", and are, therefore, entitled to language assistance under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to a particular type of service, benefit, or encounter.

Examples of populations likely to include LEP persons who are served or encountered by the DOT recipients and should be considered when planning language services include, but are not limited to:

- Public transportation passengers
- Persons who apply for a driver's license at a State department of motor vehicles
- Persons subject to the control of State or local transportation enforcement authorities, including, for example, commercial motor vehicle drivers
- Persons served by emergency transportation response programs
- Persons living in areas affected or potentially affected by transportation projects
- Business owners who apply to participate in the DOT's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program

B. FOUR FACTOR ANALYSIS:

Question 5: Has the STA developed an individualized assessment based on the four-factor analysis?

Answer: While designed to be a flexible and fact-dependent standard, the starting point is an individualized assessment that balances the following four factors:

1. the number or proportion of LEP persons served or likely to be encountered by a program, activity, or service of the recipient or grantee;
2. the frequency with which LEP individuals come into contact with the program activity;
3. the nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the recipient to people’s lives; and
4. the resources available to the recipient and costs. These four factors are further explained in the DOT LEP Guidance found in the FHWA LEP Handbook and also on the LEP website www.lep.gov.

For additional information, please refer to DOT LEP Guidance page 74091.

Question 5a: Has the STA assessed the number of LEP persons served or likely to be encountered by its programs, activities, or services?

Answer: When considering the number or proportion of LEP individuals in a service area, recipients should consider LEP parent(s) whose English proficient or LEP minor children and dependents encounter the service of DOT recipients.
Recipients should first examine their prior experiences with LEP individuals and determine the breadth and scope of language services that are needed. In conducting this analysis, it is important to: include language minority populations that are eligible beneficiaries of recipients’ programs, activities, or services but may be underserved because of existing language barriers; and consult additional data, for example, from the U.S. Census, school systems and community organizations, and data from State and local governments, community agencies, religious organizations, and legal aid entities, etc.

**Question 5b:** Has the STA assessed the frequency with which it has or should have contact with LEP individuals from different language groups seeking assistance?

**Answer:** The second factor for an STA to consider is the frequency with which LEP individuals come into contact with its programs, activities, or services. If an LEP individual accesses a program or service on a daily basis, a recipient has greater duties than if the same individual’s program or activity contact is unpredictable or infrequent. However, even recipients that serve LEP persons on an unpredictable or infrequent basis should use this balancing analysis to determine what to do if an LEP individual seeks services under the program in question.

This plan need not be intricate. It may be as simple as being prepared to use a commercial telephonic interpretation service to obtain immediate interpreter services. Additionally, in applying this standard, recipients should consider whether appropriate outreach to LEP persons could increase the frequency of contact with LEP language groups. *For additional information, please refer to DOT LEP Guidance page 74092.*

**Question 5c:** Has the STA determined whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for LEP individuals?

**Answer:** Recipients of DOT assistance include State and local agencies with emergency transportation responsibilities. In determining the extent of your obligation to provide LEP services, the nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the program (factor #3) must be considered. The more important the activity, information, service, or program, or the greater the possible consequences of the contact to the LEP individuals, the more likely language services are needed. A recipient needs to determine whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for the LEP individual.

There are two main ways to provide language services: Oral interpretation either in person or via telephone interpretation service and written translation. Oral interpretation can range from on-site interpreters for critical services provided to a high volume of LEP persons, to access through commercially available telephonic interpretation services. Written translation can range from translation of an entire document to translation of a short description of the document. In some cases, language services should be made available on an expedited basis while in others, the LEP individual may be referred to another office of the recipient for language assistance.

The correct mix should be based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis. For instance, a motor vehicle department or an emergency hazardous material clean-up team in a largely LEP neighborhood may need oral interpreters immediately and should give serious consideration to hiring bilingual staff (many such departments have already made these arrangements). Additionally, providing public transportation access to LEP persons is crucial. An LEP person’s inability to utilize effectively public transportation may adversely affect his or her ability to obtain health care, education, or access to employment.
Regardless of the type of language services provided, the quality and accuracy of those services can be critical in serious or life-threatening situations to avoid potential serious consequences to the LEP person and to the recipient. While quality and accuracy of language services are critical, they are nonetheless part of the appropriate mix of LEP services required. The quality and accuracy of language services as part of disaster relief programs, or in the provision of emergency supplies and services, for example, must be extraordinarily high, while the quality and accuracy of language services in a bicycle safety course need not meet the same exacting standards.

**Question 5d:** Has the STA explored the most cost-effective means of delivering competent and accurate language services before limiting services due to resource concerns?

**Answer:** Resources and the costs imposed may have an impact on the nature of the steps recipients should take in providing meaningful access for LEP persons. The Department is mindful that cost considerations could be inappropriately used to avoid providing otherwise reasonable and necessary language assistance. Similarly, cost considerations could be ignored or minimized to justify the provision of a particular level or type of language service even though effective alternatives exist at a minimal cost. There is a possibility that satisfying the need for language services might be quite costly for certain types of recipients, particularly if they have not updated their programs and activities to the changing needs of the populations they serve. Costs are a legitimate consideration in identifying the reasonableness of particular language assistance measures, and the DOT’s and the U.S. Department of Justice’s (DOJ’s) guidance identifies the appropriate framework through which costs are to be considered.

Resource and cost issues, however, can often be reduced by technological advances, reasonable business practices, and the sharing of language assistance materials and services among and between recipients, advocacy groups, affected populations, and Federal agencies. Examples of practices that may reduce resource and cost issues, include:

1. training bilingual staff to act as interpreters and translators,
2. information sharing through industry groups,
3. telephonic and video conferencing interpretation services,
4. translating vital documents posted on websites,
5. pooling resources and standardizing documents to reduce translation needs,
6. using qualified translators and interpreters to ensure that documents need not be “fixed” later, and that inaccurate interpretations do not cause delay or other costs,
7. centralizing interpreter and translator services to achieve economies of scale, and
8. formalized use of qualified community volunteers.

Large entities and those entities serving a significant number or proportion of LEP persons should ensure that their resource limitations are well substantiated before using cost and resource issues as a reason to limit language assistance.

*In addition, see question and answer number 8.*
Question 6: Has the STA applied the four factors to its various kinds of contacts (different types of programs or activities it engages) that it has with the public to assess language needs?

Answer: After applying the above four-factor analysis to the various kinds of contacts a recipient has with the public, the recipient may conclude that different language assistance measures are sufficient to ensure meaningful access to the different types of programs or activities in which it engages. For instance, some of a recipient’s activities will have a greater impact on or contact with LEP persons than others, and thus may require more in the way of language assistance. The flexibility that recipients have in addressing the needs of the LEP populations they serve does not diminish, and should not be used to minimize the obligation that those needs be addressed. The DOT recipients should apply the following four factors to the various kinds of contacts that they have with the public to assess language needs and decide what reasonable steps they should take to ensure meaningful access for LEP persons.

C. LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE SERVICES:

Question 7: Does the STA have a “mix” of LEP services based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis? (Example: Oral and written language services).

Answer: The four-factor analysis necessarily implicates the “mix” of LEP services required. Recipients have two main ways to provide language services: oral interpretation service and written translation service. Oral interpretation can range from on-site interpreters for critical services provided to a high volume of LEP persons to access through commercially-available telephonic interpretation services. Written translation can range from translation of an entire document to translation of a short description of the document.

The correct mix should be based on what is both necessary and reasonable in light of the four-factor analysis. For instance, a motor vehicle department or an emergency hazardous material clean-up team in a largely Hispanic neighborhood may need immediate oral interpreters available and should give serious consideration to hiring bilingual staff (many such departments have already made these arrangements). Additionally, providing public transportation access to LEP persons is crucial. An LEP person’s inability to utilize effectively public transportation may adversely affect his or her ability to obtain health care, or education, or access to employment.

Oral Language Services is also known as Interpretation. Interpretation is the process of listening to something in one language and orally interpreting it in another. The mix of LEP services under the Oral Language Services is as follows: hiring bilingual staff; hiring staff interpreters; contracting for interpreters; using telephone interpreter lines; using community volunteers; use of family members, friends, and other customers/passengers as interpreters.

Written Language Services is also known as Translation. Translation is the replacement of a written text from one language into an equivalent written text in another language. The first thing that needs to be decided is “What documents should be Translated?” Examples of documents that might be helpful to be translated are “driver’s license, automobile registration, and parking permit formats; parking tickets, citation forms, and violation or deficiency notes or pertinent portions thereof; signs in waiting rooms, reception areas, and other initial points of entry.”

In addition, please see question and answer number 2.
**Question 8:** Does the STA ensure interpreters demonstrate proficiency in, and ability to communicate information accurately in both English and in the other language and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting?

**Answer:** A competent interpreter may or may not be competent to translate. Competency requires more than self-identification as bilingual. Interpreters might be able to communicate effectively in a different language when communicating information directly in that language, but not be able to do written translation.

Competency to interpret, however, does not necessarily mean formal certification as an interpreter, although certification is helpful. When using interpreters, recipients should ensure that they:

- Demonstrate proficiency in, and ability to communicate information accurately in both English and in the other language and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting (e.g., consecutive, simultaneous, summarization, or sight interpretation).
- Have knowledge in both languages of any specialized terms or concepts peculiar to the recipient’s program or activity and of any particularized vocabulary and phraseology used by the LEP person; and understand and follow confidentiality and impartiality rules to the same extent as the recipient employee for whom they are interpreting and/or to the extent their position requires.
- Understand and adhere to their role as interpreters without deviating into a role as counselor, legal advisor, or other roles.

Additionally, some recipients may have their own requirements for interpreters, as individual rights may depend on precise, complete, and accurate interpretations or translations. In some cases, interpreters may be required to demonstrate that their involvement in a matter would not create a conflict of interest. *For additional information or examples, please refer to DOT LEP Guidance page 74093.*

**Question 8a:** Does the STA ensure that when interpretation services are needed it is provided in a timely manner in order to be effective?

**Answer:** The obligation to provide meaningful opportunity to individuals who are LEP is not limited to written translations. Oral communication between recipients and beneficiaries often is a necessary part of the exchange of information. Thus, a recipient that limits its language assistance to the provision of written materials may not be allowing LEP persons "effectively to be informed of or to participate in the program."

When interpretation is needed and is reasonable, it should be provided in a timely manner in order to be effective. Generally, to be “timely, the recipient should provide language assistance at a time and place that avoids the effective denial of the service, benefit, or rights at issue or the imposition of an undue burden on or delay in important rights, benefits, or services to the LEP person. For example: when the timeliness of services is important, such as when an LEP person needs access to public transportation, a DOT recipient does not provide meaningful LEP access when it has only one bilingual staff member available one day a week to provide the service.

There are a number of steps which can assist recipients and Federal agencies in providing such oral assistance. They range from hiring bilingual staff or staff interpreters competent in the skill of interpreting, to contracting with qualified outside in-person or telephonic interpreter services, to arranging formally for the services of qualified voluntary community interpreters who are bound by confidentiality agreements.
**Question 8b:** Based on the four-factor analysis, has the STA identified what documents should be translated?

**Answer:** It is important to ensure that written materials routinely provided in English also are provided in regularly encountered languages other than English. It is particularly important to ensure that vital documents are translated into the non-English language of each regularly encountered LEP group eligible to be served or likely to be affected by the program or activity.

It may sometimes be difficult to draw a distinction between vital and non-vital documents, particularly when considering outreach or other documents designed to raise awareness of rights or services. Though meaningful access to a program requires an awareness of the program’s existence, we recognize that it would be impossible, from a practical and cost perspective, to translate every piece of outreach material into every language. Nevertheless, it is important for Federal agencies to continually survey/assess the needs of eligible service populations in order to determine whether certain critical outreach materials should be translated into other languages to effectively prevent the denial of meaningful access to LEP individuals.

**Question 8c:** Does the STA written translation effort follow the “Safe harbor provisions?”

**Answer:** The DOT LEP guidelines offer “Safe Harbor” that recipients should consider in planning for the translation of written documents. Recipients would like to ensure with greater certainty that they comply with their obligations to provide translation in languages other than English. A “Safe Harbor” means that if a recipient provides written translations under these circumstances, such action will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient's written-translation obligations under Title VI.

The failure to provide written translations under the circumstances outlined in paragraphs (a) and (b) does not mean there is noncompliance. Rather these paragraphs merely provide a guide for recipients that would like greater certainty of compliance than can be provided by a fact-intensive, four-factor analysis. For example, even if a safe harbor is not used, if written translation of a certain document(s) would be so burdensome as to defeat the legitimate objectives of its program, it is not necessary. Other ways of providing meaningful access, such as effective oral interpretation of certain vital documents, might be acceptable under such circumstances.

The following actions will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient's written-translation obligations:

(a) The DOT recipient provides written translation of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5% or 1,000, whichever is less of the population of persons eligible to be served or likely to be affected or encountered. Translation of other documents, if needed, can be provided orally; or

(b) If there are fewer than 50 persons in a language group that reaches the 5% trigger in (a), the recipient does not translate vital written materials but provides written notice in the primary language of the LEP language group of the right to receive competent oral interpretation of those written materials, free of cost.

These safe harbor provisions apply to the translation of written documents only. They do not affect the requirement to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals through competent oral interpreters where oral language services are needed and are reasonable.
Question 8d: Based on the four-factor analysis, has the STA translated its vital documents into other languages?

Answer: A document will be considered vital if it contains information that is critical for obtaining the Federal services and/or benefits, or is required by law. Vital documents include, for example: application; consent and complaint forms; notices of rights and disciplinary action; notices advising LEP persons of the availability of free language assistance; and written tests that do not assess English language competency, but rather, competency for a particular license, job, or skill for which English competency is not required; and letters or notices that require a response from the beneficiary or client. For instance, if a complaint form is necessary in order to file a claim with an agency, that complaint form would be vital, as would be notices of public hearings regarding recipients’ proposed transportation plans and/or projects, etc. Non-vital information includes documents that are not critical to access such benefits and services. Advertisements of Federal agency tours and copies of testimony presented to Congress that are available for informational purposes would be considered non-vital information.

Vital documents must be translated when a significant number or percentage of the population eligible to be served, or likely to be directly affected by the program/activity, needs services or information in a language other than English to communicate effectively. For many larger documents, translation of vital information contained within the document will suffice and the documents need not be translated in their entirety.

In addition, please see question and answer number 8c.

Question 9: Has the STA ensured that the quality and accuracy of the language service avoids potential serious consequences to the LEP person and to the STA?

Answer: When using interpreters, recipients should ensure that they:

- Demonstrate proficiency in the ability to communicate information accurately in both English and the other language and identify and employ the appropriate mode of interpreting (e.g., consecutive, simultaneous, summarization, or sight translation).
- Have knowledge in both languages or any specialized terms or concepts peculiar to the recipient’s program or vocabulary and phraseology used by the LEP person;
- Understand and follow confidentiality and impartiality rules to the same extent as the recipient employee for whom they are interpreting and/or to the extent their position requires.
- Understand and adhere to their role as interpreters without deviating into a role as counselor, legal advisor, or other roles.
- Additional considerations include whether the interpreter’s involvement in a manner would create a conflict of interest and whether the LEP service is provided in a timely manner so as not to effectively deny access to services.

In addition, please see question and answer number 5c.

Question 10: Does the STA use family members, friends, other customers/passengers as interpreters?

Answer: Although recipients should not plan to rely on an LEP person's family members, friends, or other informal interpreters to provide meaningful access to important programs and activities, where LEP persons so desire, they should be permitted to use an interpreter of their choice at their own expense (whether a professional interpreter, family member, or friend) in place of, or as a supplement to the free language services expressly offered by the recipient. LEP persons may feel more comfortable when a trusted family member or friend acts as an interpreter. In addition, in exigent
circumstances that are not reasonably foreseeable, temporary use of interpreters not provided by the recipient may be necessary. However, with proper planning and implementation, recipients should be able to avoid most such situations.

Recipients, however, should take special care to ensure that family members, legal guardians, caretakers, and other informal interpreters are appropriate in light of the circumstances and subject matter of the program, service or activity, including protection of the recipient's own administrative, mission-related, or enforcement interest in accurate interpretation. In many circumstances, family members (especially children) or friends are not competent to provide quality and accurate interpretations. Issues of confidentiality, privacy, or conflict of interest may also arise. LEP individuals may feel uncomfortable revealing or describing sensitive or confidential information to a family member, friend, or member of the local community. In addition, such informal interpreters may have a personal connection to the LEP person or an undisclosed conflict of interest, such as the desire to obtain an LEP person's personal identification information, for example, in the case of an LEP person attempting to apply for a driver's license. Thus, DOT recipients should generally offer free interpreter services to the LEP person. This is particularly true in situations in which health, safety, or access to important benefits and services are at stake, or when credibility and accuracy are important to protect an individual's rights and access to important services.

An example of such a case is when no interpreters, or bilingual or symbolic signs are available in a State department of motor vehicles. In an effort to apply for a driver's license, vehicle registration, or parking permit, an LEP person may be forced to enlist the help of a stranger for translation. This practice may raise serious issues of competency or confidentiality and may compromise the personal security of the LEP person, as the stranger could have access to the LEP person's personal identification information, such as his or her name, phone number, address, social security number, driver's license number (if different from the social security number), and medical information. However, there are situations where proper application of the four factors would lead to a conclusion that recipient-provided services are not necessary.

An example of this is a voluntary educational tour of an airport, or a train or bus station. There, the importance and nature of the activity may be relatively low and unlikely to implicate issues of confidentiality, conflict of interest, or the need for accuracy. In addition, the resources needed and costs of providing language services may be high. In such a setting, an LEP person's use of family, friends, or others to interpret may be appropriate.

If the LEP person voluntarily chooses to provide his or her own interpreter, a recipient should consider whether a record of that choice and of the recipient's offer of assistance is appropriate. Where precise, complete, and accurate interpretations or translations of information and/or testimony are critical, or where the competency of the LEP person's interpreter is not established, a recipient might decide to provide its own, independent interpreter, even if an LEP person wants to use his or her own interpreter as well. Extra caution should be exercised when the LEP person chooses to use a minor as the interpreter. While the LEP person's decision should be respected, there may be additional issues of competency, confidentiality, or conflict of interest when the choice involves using children as interpreters. The recipient should take care to ensure that the LEP person's choice is voluntary, that the LEP person is aware of the possible problems if the preferred interpreter is a minor child, and that the LEP person knows that a competent interpreter could be provided by the recipient at no cost.
D. ELEMENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE LEP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN:

Question 11: Does the STA have an LEP implementation Plan?
Answer: DOT’s LEP guidance identifies 5 steps and related techniques that are helpful in designing an LEP plan: the use of language assistance cards; a description of the way in which language assistance will be provided; staff training; effective notice to LEP persons using signs and outreach documents; and LEP plan monitoring.

Question 11a: Does the STA LEP Plan contain, at a minimum, the five elements identified in the USDOT LEP guidance?
Answer: After completing the four-factor analysis and deciding what language assistance services are appropriate, a recipient should develop an implementation plan to address the identified need of the LEP population it services. The plan must also include the four (4) factor analysis and its results.

An effective implementation plan on language assistance for LEP persons should include, at a minimum the following elements:

- Identification of LEP individuals who need language assistance
- Language assistance measures
- Training staff
- Providing notices to LEP persons
- Monitoring and updating the LEP plan

FHWA recipients are required to submit their LEP Plan as part of their standard Title VI assurances, Title IV Plan and implementing Title VI regulations. In certain circumstances, such as in complaint investigations or compliance reviews, recipients may be required to provide Federal agencies with a copy of any plan created by the recipient.

Question 11b: Does the STA LEP Plan include information about ways in which language assistance will be provided? (Example: LEP plan to include procedures on how to respond to LEP callers and how to respond to written communications from LEP persons).
Answer: An effective LEP plan should include information about the ways in which language assistance will be provided. For instance, recipients may want to include information on the following:

- Types of language services available;
- How recipient staff can obtain those services;
- How to respond to written communications from LEP persons;
- How to respond to LEP individuals who have in-person contact with recipient staff;
- How to ensure competency of interpreters and translation services.
Question 11c: Do the STA employees know their obligations to provide meaningful access to Information and services for LEP persons?

Answer: Staff members should know their obligations to provide meaningful access to information and services for LEP persons, and all employees in public contact positions should be properly trained. An effective LEP plan would likely include training to ensure that:

- Staff knows about LEP policies and procedures;
- Staff having contact with the public (or those in a recipient’s custody) is trained to work effectively with in-person and telephone interpreters.

Recipients may want to include this training as part of the orientation for new employees. Recipients have flexibility in deciding the manner in which the training is provided. Obviously, the more frequent the contact with LEP persons, the greater the need will be for in-depth training.

Question 11d: Does the STA ensure management is aware of LEP responsibilities and understands the LEP Plan so they can reinforce its importance and ensure its implementation by staff?

Answer: Even if management staff may not interact regularly with LEP persons, they should be fully aware of, and understand the plan so they can reinforce its importance and ensure its implementation by staff.

Question 11e: Does the STA notify LEP persons of the services available and that they are free of charge?

Answer: Once the recipient has decided, based on the four-factor analysis, that it will provide language services, it is important that the recipient notify the LEP persons of services that are available free of charge.

Question 11f: Does the STA provide notices in languages LEP persons would understand?

Answer: Recipient should provide notices in languages LEP persons would understand. Examples of notification that recipients should consider include: Posting signs in intake areas and other entry points, Announcements could be in, for instance, brochures, booklets, and in outreach and recruitment information; working with community based organizations; including notices in local newspapers in languages other than English; providing notice in ration and television stations about the available language services and how to get them, etc.

Examples of the types of notification to consider are listed in DOT’s LEP Guidance pages 74097 and 74097.
**Question 11g:** Does the STA have an ongoing process to monitor its language assistance policies and procedures at least annually, to evaluate its effectiveness at serving LEP individuals and modify it accordingly?

**Answer:** Recipients should, where appropriate, have a process for determining, on an ongoing basis, whether new documents, programs, services, and activities need to be made accessible for LEP individuals, and they may want to provide notice of any changes in services to the LEP public and to employees. In addition, recipients should consider whether changes in demographics, types of services, or other needs require annual reevaluation of their LEP plan. A good way a recipient can evaluate the LEP plan is to seek feedback from the community. In their reviews, recipients may want to consider assessing changes in:

- Current LEP populations in the service area or populations affected or encountered.
- Frequency of encounters with LEP language groups.
- Nature and importance of activities to LEP persons.
- Availability of resources, including technological advances and sources of additional resources, and the costs imposed.
- Whether existing assistance is meeting the needs of LEP persons.
- Whether staff knows and understands the LEP plan and how to implement it.
- Whether identified sources for assistance are still available and viable.

In addition to the five elements of a viable plan, an effective plan needs to be reevaluated on an annual basis and updated accordingly. Clear goals should be established, management should be held accountable, and there should be an opportunity for input and planning throughout the period.